# A Final Report on the COPS Office Justice Based After-School (JBAS) Pilot Program:

**Prepared for:**

**Office of Community Oriented Policing Services**
**U.S. Department of Justice**

**Prepared by:**

William R. Blount and Associates, Inc.
Evaluation, Grants Management and Program Consultants
7209 Hammett Road
Tampa, FL 33647-1206

Phone: (813) 978-0470 FAX: (813) 978-9744

**April 24, 2002**

**William R. Blount, Ph.D. & Carol E. Rasor, Ph.D.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recognizing the need for after school programs as an important component of crime prevention, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) initiated the Justice Based After-School (JBAS) pilot program in October 2000 by providing two million dollars to encourage police agencies and community-based organizations to work in partnership to bring more of an academic approach to existing after-school programs. The enhanced programs were to be designed to foster educational, cultural, life skills, and social and recreational opportunities for youth during after school hours. The underlying mission was to give children the tools they need to make important life decisions correctly. Thus, the law enforcement agencies applying for these funds were required to partner with one or more youth based community organizations such as a Police Athletic League or a Boys and Girls Club. The vision of the COPS Office was to provide, through this pilot program, after-school programs that could be adopted by other communities.

The sites selected literally stretched from coast to coast and the cities represented quite diverse differences in both the demographics of the youth and the programs, themselves.

The JBAS/PAL pilot programs were in the main successful and accomplished their objectives. They engaged large numbers of both male and female targeted at-risk middle school youth during high-risk hours, with interesting and challenging activities in safe environments -- made safer by the presence of law enforcement. They engaged a wide variety of individuals in a wide variety of venues. They stressed personal growth and achievement in academics, cultural activities, recreation and sports. They involved great numbers of both individuals and organizations as partners and harnessed public and private resources. They exposed youth to police officers in positive roles. The programs were creative in their delivery of services and provided a variety of approaches from which to choose, for those who wish to enrich existing programs or initiate new ones.

Just for the months covered by this report, the JBAS Program paid for the combined talents of an average of 23.6 individuals each month, who put in 444.8 hours on average each month to make some 40,176 hours of after school programming possible. Including the summer programming, the totals were an average of 35.8 persons per month spending and average of 1203.7 average hours per month to provide some 102,587 hours of contact with youth.

As a result:

@ Academic performance and behavior improved significantly over time.

@ Program participants earned significantly higher grades in academic and behavior than did a matched control group.

@ Significant improvements in self-esteem were recorded.

@ 76% of the youth said being in the program prevented them from being in a gang and 88% said being in the program helped them say no to gang membership.

@ Almost no substance abuse was reported.

@ Parents, youth, partners and teachers all indicated a high level of satisfaction with the programs, the staff and the officers.

@ Youth were seen to exhibit positive behavior changes both in and out of school. They were seen to have better social skills, better grades, a willingness to take responsibility, self discipline, more respect for others, more respect for themselves and more confidence in themselves.

@ While everyone reported better attitudes toward the police involved with the programs, youth were more willing to generalize these positive feelings to the neighborhood or to police in general than were adults.

@ The extent of the involvement and the officer's personality appeared to be the factors associated with establishing positive relationships.


Recommendations:

1. Identify additional funding to continue and expand these programs, not only in the pilot cities, but in others as well.

2. Change the funding formula in terms of how much funding is available each year.

3. Change the funding cycle to correspond to the academic school calendar, with the prior summer devoted to planning and program design.

4. Maintain evaluation funding for the life of the projects.

**A Final Report on the COPS Office Justice
Based After-School (JBAS) Pilot Program**

**INTRODUCTION**

<u>**What is JBAS?**</u>

Recognizing the need for after-school programs as an important component of crime prevention, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) initiated the Justice Based After-School (JBAS) pilot program in October 2000 by providing two million dollars to encourage police agencies and community-based organizations to work in partnership to bring more of an academic approach to existing after-school programs. The enhanced programs were to be designed to foster educational, cultural, life skills, social and recreational opportunities for youth during after-school hours. The underlying mission was to give children the tools they need to make important life decisions correctly. Thus, the law enforcement agencies applying for these funds were required to partner with one or more youth based community organizations such as a Police Athletic League or a Boys and Girls Club. The vision of the COPS Office was to provide, through this pilot program, model after-school programs that could be adopted by other communities.

The COPS Office sculptured the JBAS pilot program with a three-part approach. The first part funded six sites (five are reported on in this document) to develop enhanced programs. The second part funded the development of a youth-based after-school program "How-To/Promising Practices" training manual for law enforcement departments and officers and provided for several training events. The third part funded a final report of the JBAS pilot program. This report was prepared by those individuals responsible for collecting and presenting the data associated with that report.

<u>**A Brief Rationale For Justice Based After-School Programs**</u>

School-age children from single parent households or households where both parents work require non-parental supervision during the hours their parents are not available -- typically after-school and early evening. Youth in these circumstances, particularly those from areas where crime rates are high, are often labeled as "at-risk" youth. Research has indicated a number of common factors to which youth at risk are exposed. These include emotional and psychological problems, school failure, domestic violence, association with delinquent peers, favorable community attitudes toward drug and alcohol use and inadequate positive opportunities and activities available within the community. The results can be high rates of drug and alcohol use, school dropout, teenage pregnancy, suicide, and participation in crime (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1995).

On the other hand, the reduction of the impact of these risk factors can be

accomplished by bonding to successful adults and peers, having clear social norms at home and in the community, having success in school and having positive and healthy alternative activities available (Schorr, 1988; Halpern, 1999).

There clearly is a need for after-school programs to provide a structured environment for at-risk youth. JBAS sites can help fill this need in a number of beneficial ways. First and foremost was the provision of positive activities in a safe environment. "Positive" and "safe" are key issues. As a Community Oriented Policing initiative, a law enforcement agency was always the applicant. The presence of law enforcement officers directly effects the second issue (a safe environment) by alleviating the security concerns of operating a youth program in a high crime area after school hours. The officers can also serve as a powerful resource to provide positive role models for the youth. In addition, law enforcement officers acting as coaches and mentors might also assist in reducing the fear of law enforcement among these youth and eventually increase the youth's trust both in individual officers and in law enforcement in general, demonstrating community policing in its truest sense. Hopefully, the combination of positive things to do with positive role models would also lead to a reduction in delinquent behavior. Thus, JBAS programs can also be considered to be viable crime prevention tools.

The COPS Office awarded grant funding to law enforcement agencies in cities throughout the nation that were already associated with existing after-school programs with innovative promising practices. The law enforcement agencies and their cities covered in this report are the Indianapolis Police Department, Indianapolis, Indiana; the Lawrence Police Department, Lawrence, Massachusetts; the Minneapolis Police Department, Minneapolis, Minnesota; the Portland Police Bureau, Portland, Oregon; and the Stamford Police Department, Stamford, Connecticut. As required by the grant, each of these law enforcement agencies had partnerships with a primary partner to deliver youth oriented services to their respective communities. Two of the most consistent partners are the Police Athletic Leagues and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

## Description of the Sites

### Stamford, Connecticut

The Stamford Police Department partnered with Domus Foundation's Trailblazers Academy to open this JBAS Program on March 19, 2001. The Domus Foundation was founded in 1972 as a nonprofit organization and is skilled in residential and community-based programs for youth. Trailblazers Academy received a five-year charter in 1999 and is a recognized magnet middle school for students who have experienced either academic or behavioral difficulties or both in traditional schools. Trailblazers has a unique ratio of students to teachers as each class consists of 12 students with 1 teacher and 1 educational assistant.

Two school resource officers (SRO's) from Stamford are assigned to the JBAS

program on a daily basis to serve as coaches and mentors. As a school, Trailblazers also has its own SRO. A strong partnership among the staff, the students, and their families is also encouraged, in that each parent and/or guardian is required to volunteer 30 hours of service to the program.

This JBAS program places a strong emphasis on academics. The program commences at 3:30 p.m. with snack time until 3:45 p.m. From 3:35 to 4:35 p.m. each day "homework help" is offered to the students. During this time the youth work on their homework or participate in academically oriented activities. Teachers and high school student workers offer assistance. Staff also incorporate problem solving and team building activities in this academic program.

From 4:35 until 8:30pm various recreational activities are available. Students can participate in a dance/drill team, modern dance, break dancing, arts and crafts, board games, computers, basketball, football, baseball, and soccer. While all students participate in some physical recreational activity, reading and computer activities are also available throughout the time. The staff and SRO's encourage boys to participate in dance/drill team, while girls are encouraged to participate in activities such as basketball or soccer. The goal of the recreational segment of this program is to promote good health, teamwork, self-confidence, and to teach youth how to have age appropriate fun.

Other programs offered (especially on rainy days) include first aid, CPR, personal hygiene (separately for each sex), modern dance, jazz and hip-hop.

A five-week summer program sponsored by the School Resource Officers of Stamford is also provided to the youth. The possibility of an Explorers Post or Scout Troop is being explored with the SRO's.

The primary partnerships for this program exist among the Trailblazers Academy, the Stamford Police Department, and the City of Stamford. Partnerships also exist with the Stamford Recreational Department and the YMCA. The Child Guidance Clinics are partners to provide mental health resources.

**Lawrence, Massachusetts**

Project Hope is an after-school enrichment program for at-risk children between the ages of 6 and 18. This JBAS program is a project of Hoops for Hope, a local non-profit organization that has been serving the youth of Lawrence since 1993. Hoops for Hope was created when concerned citizens, the Lawrence Police Department and the Lawrence Housing Authority entered into a collaborative partnership to address the educational, cultural and recreational programming needs of the community's youth. Most of this population can be considered to live in poverty or falling into the low to moderate income range.

The after-school program is based in a Community Center next to Bruce middle school, operates from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and focuses on assistance with homework

during the first hour. The second hour focuses on computer games, web page development, movie making and other activities of interest.

The girl's dance team and boy's dance team specializing in hip hop, break dancing, popping, etc are very popular and (along with a folk dance program) provide instruction in dances from Europe, Asia, Africa and South America. Instrumental music instruction, a jazz band, beginner instrumental and chorus activities have been integrated into the Bruce school curriculum.

Because the Hoops for Hope organization supports Project Hope with facilities, equipment and staff, and Project Hope was designed specifically to enhance Hoops for Hope, it is sometimes difficult to determine where one program ends and the other begins. Specific to Project Hope, two coaches ("Youth Staffers") oversee the softball and baseball teams. These coaches are part-time employees who are full-time educators. Two other educators support the dance/arts and the technology program.

Project Hope has also been able to support the recreational projects of other community partners. Four new portable batting cages and pitching machines were purchased and placed in the Community Center's gymnasium. As a result, the freshmen, junior varsity and varsity baseball teams from Lawrence High School can conduct practice in-doors. To support the recreational efforts of the Lawrence Boys and Girls Club, Project Hope sponsored and hosted their basketball team games also held at the Community Center's gymnasium.

Project Hope also created a partnership with the Lawrence Youth Football League and revitalized the South Lawrence East Little League. Clinics were held at the Community Center's gymnasium with the Pop Warner coaching team and staff from Project Hope working together to provide instruction to the participants.

The summer basketball is open to youth from across the city with games every afternoon and evening all summer long. The courts at Sullivan Park are continuously active. Youth are hired to assist in operating the league and Lawrence Police Officers work special details to provide a safe and secure environment for the participants, in addition to serving as coaches and referees.


### Minneapolis, Minnesota

Awarded to the Minneapolis Police Department, the Minneapolis JBAS Program is the result of a heavy commitment to the Minneapolis Police Athletic League (PAL) by the Department. The primary partners are the Minneapolis Public Schools, the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board and the Minnesota National Guard. Currently, the PAL office is located in a National Guard facility.

The Minneapolis PAL is a non-profit organization founded in 1996 by Minneapolis Police Chief Robert K. Olson. This PAL also includes its youth in the planning and development of programs through a Youth Forum. The Police Department supports PAL with three full time sworn personnel and two full time non-sworn personnel.

The Police Department's other sworn members are encouraged to participate in PAL programs through a one-for-one compensation of hours, up to six hours a week. Many also volunteer their time. The mission of the Minneapolis PAL is for law enforcement officers to mentor inner-city youth, by providing quality activities and programs.

Programs can be found at the Jordan Park School of Extended Learning (a "year round" school) and at Anderson Elementary, among others. Programs open to PAL kids include: baseball; softball; T-ball; golf; Boundary Waters; Camp Chi Rho; summer field trips, rock climbing, roller blading, fishing clinic and tournament; Theater Thursdays; Mentoring a student; Police Explorers, Youth Forum, football, volleyball; soccer; basketball; and ASCOOL (After School Cops Out On Location) for Southeast Asian students with a separate ASCOOL for Hispanic youth. Other programs include baseball, softball, bowling, boxing, mentoring a student, football, volleyball, soccer, basketball, and a Youth Bicycling Team.

### Indianapolis, Indiana

The Indianapolis JBAS Program is the result of collaboration between the Indianapolis Police Department and its non-profit affiliate Police Athletic League. In addition, specifically for this program, partnerships were strengthened with the Wheeler Boys and Girls Club (North District), Lilly Boys and Girls Club (South District), St. Phillip Neri Church School (East District) and Christamore House (West District).

Chief Jerry Barker, who was a PAL kid himself, reorganized the Indianapolis Police Department's (IPD) approach to youth services. IPD/PAL activities were infused into the Youth Services Unit. Chief Barker increased the staffing of the Youth Services Unit from one sergeant and four officers to one captain, one lieutenant, two sergeants, eleven officers, and five civilian employees, and specifically assigned PAL as a main responsibility, changing the name of the unit to the "PAL Youth Education Section." The Captain's official title is "PAL/Youth Services Branch Supervisor." PAL services shifted from a centralized to a decentralized delivery system to promote the philosophy of community policing. A PAL officer and civilian are assigned to each of the four affiliated centers located in the district offices to work with the district level COPS officers to enhance youth programs

The JBAS program activities included a crucial training session for officers who would be working with youth. In March of 2001, 30 officers participated in a training session to examine youth development, lesson planning, behavioral indicators, and other youth-oriented topics. This training was presented by one of the community partners, the Marion County Commission on Youth.

Several programs could be initiated because of the overtime provided by the JBAS grant. All the programs enable the children to interact with both police officers and other professionals on a daily basis to experience positive interactions with adult role models.

The Homework/Mentoring Program is offered at each of the centers. For this program, a partnership exists among the teachers, officers, and volunteers who work in unison. Attempting to maintain a one-to-five ratio, students are required to finish their homework before engaging in other activities.

Other programs at each location differ as a function of facilities and staffing (only Wheeler has a pool for example). These programs are many and varied and include: the PAL Computer Club, an eight week life skills program, bowling, chess club, boxing, basketball, softball, a fishing club, chess (taught by a master champion), Tae Kwon Do, "Get Walking With IPD", ballet, tap dancing, drama, piano and organ, volleyball, etc. Field trips included visits to the Indianapolis Juvenile Children's Museum, Conseco Field House, the NCAA Hall of Champions, the Center, the Indianapolis 500 Race Track, Victory Field, the Governor's Residence, the General Assembly, and the Indianapolis Police Department.

The life skills program teaches critical skills for success such as the importance of reading, writing, listening skills, dress and image skills, budgeting and preparing for a job.

The Soapbox Derby offers an opportunity to learn how to design, assemble, and race soapbox derby cars. One police officer, one community advisor and five youth are assigned to a team to compete with their peers.

PAL officers are also working with juveniles who have been arrested. In partnership with the juvenile probation officers, weekly visits are made to the juvenile's home to ensure compliance with the conditions of court release and to encourage these youth to become involved in PAL as a productive way to spend their time and to keep out of further trouble.

### Portland, Oregon

The Portland JBAS Program is the result of collaboration between the Portland Police Bureau and its non-profit affiliate the Police Activities League of Greater Portland, a non-profit corporation which builds partnerships among youth, police and the community through recreational, athletic and educational programs. The Police Activities League of Greater Portland was initially established in 1989 as a response to the increased number of gangs entering the Portland Community from the I-5 corridor from California.

Staffed by civilians and law enforcement officers, PAL is physically housed in the Portland Police Bureau's Northeast Community Policing Center. The Executive Director

and the COPS Grant Fiscal Manager report directly to the Chief of Police. Both are non-sworn positions. Recruited officers serve as coaches and mentors.

The Officers of the Portland Police Bureau also support the organizational structure. The Portland Police Bureau, Gresham Police Department, Multnomah County Sheriff's Office, Portland Public School Police, and the Troutdale Police Department have entered into an agreement to provide officers to the program through the use of budgeted overtime funds.

Parks and community centers are made available through the Parks and Recreation Department. Portland Public Schools provides PAL access to classrooms, gymnasiums, sports fields, and equipment at no charge. These programs are administered by the Portland Parks and Recreation Community Schools and/or the Schools Uniting Neighborhoods (SUN) Program.

Other partners have included the Youth Gangs Task Force, Student Attendance Initiative, Touchstone, Head Start, Portland Youth Redirection, and the Oregon Council For Hispanic Advancement.

PAL of Greater Portland provides a diverse array of programs at their many sites. Programs are frequently scheduled for one day a week at a given school and then rotated to other school sites. The Portland PAL also operates a Youth Center which also provides after-school activities.

Programs offered include: the Mad Science Program (students are selected by the School Principal to participate in science activities), break dancing, trust-building games, library activities, community service activities, ceramic – pottery classes, soccer, basketball, a math program, gym activities, a tutoring program, arts and crafts, homework assistance, youth support groups, weight training, table tennis, billiards, computer lab, Brazilian Dance, baseball, tumbling, archery, boxing, soccer, football, volleyball, sports teams and camps, education, job learning skills, special events, volleyball, martial arts, tennis, and field trips.

The PAL Summer Sports Camp is a one-week camp held in June and offers the participants 14 different sports. The National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) is a five-week summer day camp that offers sports instruction, educational enrichment, medical exams, field trips, and two meals a day. The Asian Basketball Camp is a one-week camp for Asian youth run by Asian officers. The Spring Break Violence Free Camp offers field trips, sports instruction, recreation, educational enrichment, and community service.

## METHODOLOGY

Both Qualitative and Quantitative data were sought in order to document the

activities of each site and to assess impact. The five general areas of impact assessment were academic performance, school conduct, self-esteem, relations with law enforcement and risk-taking behavior (gang membership and substance use).

Quantitative data sought included demographic data on the participants and the types of activities in which they were involved, information on grades, school conduct, self-esteem and criminal involvement ("Participant Data Base"). In addition, the attempt was made to identify a "control group" of youth at each site, for which the same quantitative data were sought. Assistance was provided for the construction of a participant data base (Appendix A), the monthly report of activities (Appendix A), and the many interactions with the multitude of school systems and law enforcement agencies.

Qualitative data were obtained from site visits and the numerous focus groups conducted at each site. Opinions were sought in four general categories: 1) program satisfaction, 2) the safety of the young participants, 3) trust issues (including the youth's trust of police), and 4) perceptions of the police by parents, friends and neighbors. Separate focus groups were held for a) parents, b) program participants (youth), c) staff, d) law enforcement, e) partners and f) teachers. Questions were specifically designed for each of the four areas for each of the six groups (see Appendix A for specific questions).

Lists of individuals in each of the six categories were provided to the evaluators who made random selections from each list and discussed group composition and timing. Where the number of persons in a category was small (e.g., staff, law enforcement, partners, teachers), an effort was made to include them all. In general, we included as many of the most active persons as possible in addition to individuals whose participation was less frequent in order to obtain the broadest range of views and input. Site personnel arranged the times and locations for each of the focus groups and were responsible for contacting the selected participants. Finding times and locations which were convenient for the participants' schedules and encouraging them to attend was a site priority. At any given site, the focus groups were held from early morning to late at night, in a multitude of locations typically within a day or two.

The focus groups were conducted by the evaluators in such a way that everyone provided input and each person was actively encouraged to elaborate on their responses. Before the evaluators left the site, issues and reactions were provided to site personnel.

## RESULTS

Because of the uniqueness of each site and the complexities associated with obtaining the various data items, not all five sites were able to provide all the information sought

for the Participant Data Base. The primary issues encountered were confidentiality, privacy, availability and compatibility. Some state laws and local policies simply prohibit sharing information on juveniles, and the typical approaches used by investigators (lists of names provided with the names removed when the lists were returned with the information sought, group summary statistics, etc.) were rejected. Obviously, similar problems were encountered when attempting to build "control groups."

However, at least some of the quantitative data items were available at most sites, and "control groups" were constructed at two sites.

All sites provided the monthly reports of activities [records of programs, participation (numbers of individuals), and staff hours]. And all sites participated in the focus groups and site visits. Four of the five gave the pre and post self-esteem questionnaires which also included questions concerning trust issues with law enforcement, gang involvement and substance use.

## PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, ATTENDANCE and STAFFING LEVELS

### Participant Characteristics: Demographics

As reflected in Table 1, each of the sites targeted at-risk youth, generally of middle school age.   Overall, the majority of the youth involved were ages 12 and 13, with the average age being 12.55 years.

The ages also varied depending on the specific activity and time of year (summer programming v. winter) and those shown here are accumulated averages.

Regarding gender, every site engaged slightly more males than females (overall 55.8% males, 44.2% females). Indianapolis had the largest difference (63% males, 37% females) and Portland the least (51% males, 49% females). Every site made specific efforts to include females and, as was true of age, gender proportions also varied depending on the activity.

In terms of race/ethnicity data, the diversity of the sites varied dramatically, depending both on the target group and area demographics. Minneapolis and Portland were virtually identical with more African Americans (42%) than Caucasians (30%). Indianapolis on the other hand, had almost 2/3 African Americans (61%) and 1/3 Caucasians (37%). While Stamford also

### TABLE 1

### Participant Youth Age, Race and Sex summaries across sites

| Age (%) | Lawrence | Stamford | Indy | Mn | Portland | Average % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 & under | 19 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 5 | 7.6 |
| 11 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 23 | 12.6 |
| 12 | 11 | 54 | 30 | 38 | 29 | 32.4 |

9

|  | Lawrence | Stamford | Indy | Mn | Portland | Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 7 | 32 | 17 | 27 | 20 | 20.6 |
| 14 | 25 | 9 | 16 | 18 | 9 | 15.4 |
| 15 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 14 | 11.0 |
| 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 |
| Total % | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.0 |
| n | 134 | 119 | 296 | 122 | 206 | 877.0 |
| Average | 12.79 | 12.65 | 11.96 | 12.89 | 12.47 | **12.55** |

| Sex (%) | Lawrence | Stamford | Indy | Mn | Portland | Average % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 54 | 56 | 63 | 55 | 51 | 55.8 |
| Female | 46 | 44 | 37 | 45 | 49 | 44.2 |
| Total % | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.0 |

| Race (%) | Lawrence | Stamford | Indy | Mn | Portland | Average % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Caucasian | 10 | 9 | 37 | 30 | 30 | 23.2 |
| African Am | 5 | 61 | 61 | 42 | 42 | 42.2 |
| Hispanic | 85 | 27 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 25.6 |
| Asian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 3.2 |
| Other | 0 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 12 | 5.8 |
| Total % | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.0 |

served primarily African Americans (61%), their next most common group was Hispanics (27%). Finally, Lawrence engaged Hispanics almost exclusively (85%), reflecting the large Dominican population in that city.

**Attendance at Activities**

The actual number of youth involved in the activities of the various JBAS programs was difficult to assess, as some youth were seen on only one occasion during the reporting period, while others were seen from time to time and still others were involved almost daily. Further, not all sites were equipped to track individual youth over time, as the "counting" systems were oriented toward the number of youth seen each day, or the number of youth involved in a particular activity. As youth were often involved in more than one activity in more than one month, which would lead to multiple counts of youth, the sites were asked to single count and report the number of youth

who were involved in one or more activities each month. Thus the average number of youth involved per month are reported. Although not reported here, each site also tracked each individual activity each month and the number of youth who participated in them.

Because programming was quite different when school was in session and when it was not (summer) the monthly data are divided accordingly. Averages including both segments are also presented. The after-school portion included the months of April - May, and September - October, 2001. Summer months were June, July and August of the same year.

### Programs After-School

Looking first at the After-School Programs when school was in session, Table 2 Part 1 (see Appendix B) presents the monthly youth counts for each of the five sites. The average monthly figures for "current participants" are in each case larger than those for "new this month," indicating that for the most part, each site recruited youth who were already participating in one or more of their sponsored activities. This was to be expected since these funds were to be used to enhance preexisting programs. On average, 105 "current" youth were involved each month in the programs after- school. An average of 30 additional "new this month" youth were also identified and included as well, bringing the overall average to 135.7 youth involved in the after-school programs in any given month.

In order to get a sense of the extent of involvement, the number of hours each of these youngsters were engaged was also reported monthly. Here the average was 1692.5 hours per month, or approximately 12 ½ hours of involvement each month for each of the 135 youth. The actual amount of programming offered each month by each site was considerably more than 12 ½ hours a month (ranging from roughly 60 to 168).

Unlike the number of youth, the number of hours these youngsters were engaged could be totaled. For the After-School programming months, that total was 40,176 hours of actual youth contact.

### Summer Programs

For the summer months (Table 3 Part 1: see Appendix B) both the average number of youth and the average number of hours increased. This was because several of the sites involved their staff in sports league play where many times the number of youth could participate as could be accommodated in after-school programs, especially intensive after-school programs such as computer skills, homework help and tutoring. This was also true of the camps sponsored by some of the sites.

In the summer months, the monthly average number of "new" participants exceeded the monthly average number of "current" participants (152.0 v. 135.4),

11

indicating the success of the recruiting efforts of the sites for (and perhaps greater attractiveness of) the leagues and camps, and that a new group of youngsters had reached the required age and were now eligible to participate. In all, an average of 287.4 youth were accommodated each month in the summer programs; programs which averaged 4,801.7 hours each month, or approximately 17 hours of involvement each month for each of the 287 youth.

As was true for the After-School Programs, the number of hours these youngsters were engaged in the summer could also be added. For the Summer Programs, the total was 62,422 hours over the three months. Added to the 40,176 hours accumulated during the After-School Programming months, the overall total was 102,587 hours of contact with youth which were funded by the grant program.

Average number of youth and hours per month

| After-School Programs | 135.7 youth per month | 1692.5 hours per month |
| Summer Programs | 287.4 youth per month | 4801.7 hours per month |
| Total | 211.5 youth per month | 3247.1 hours per month |

Total hours

| After-School Programs | 40,167 hours of activities | 12 ½ per month per youth |
| Summer Programs | 62,422 hours of activities | 17 per month per youth |
| Total | 102,587 hours of activities | 15 per month per youth |

**Staffing Levels**

Both paid and volunteer staff were used in the delivery of services. Tables 2 and 3, Parts 2 & 3 contain the complete monthly data documenting both sworn and non-sworn in each category for each month. Table 2 documents the months school was in session, and Table 3 documents the summer months.

**Programs After-School**

As the Tables in Appendix B indicate, and as described earlier in the site descriptions, the use of compensated hours (on duty vs. overtime) for sworn law enforcement officers varied by site. All but Lawrence paid for at least part of the law enforcement officers' hours in the after-school program (Lawrence officers were all volunteers), and Indianapolis and Stamford paid for them all (no volunteered hours).

Portland and Minneapolis had both paid and volunteer hours recorded by law enforcement. In fact, Indianapolis and Stamford also had a mix of paid and volunteer hours provided by law enforcement officers, as for some of the officers in Indianapolis and all the officers in Stamford, part of their job assignment was the after-school program. All of them put in more hours than they were compensated for. At Stamford, for example, it is also the School Resource Officers who organize, help raise funds for and help to staff the Summer Camp as a means of staying in contact with the youth they interact with during the school year.

Each program had at least 2 and sometimes as many as 15 paid civilian staff (non-sworn) during the school year to complement the law enforcement involvement and to run the programs. All civilian participation was part time.

Paid Staff: Programs After-School

| Sworn | 4.6 avg per month | 36.2 avg hours per month |
|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Non-sworn | 5.6 avg per month | 292.8 avg hours per month |
| All paid Staff | 10.2 avg per month | 329.0 avg hours per month |

The use of volunteers, both sworn and non-sworn civilians also varied greatly across the sites, although there were roughly twice as many non-sworn civilian volunteers involved in the after-school programs than sworn. These individuals also accounted for more hours.

Volunteer Staff: Programs After-School

| Sworn | 4.5 avg per month | 46.0 avg hours per month |
|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Non-sworn | 8.8 avg per month | 69.8 avg hours per month |
| All volunteer staff | 13.4 avg per month | 115.8 avg hours per month |

Together, it took the combined talents of an average of 23.6 individuals each month, putting in some 444.8 hours to make the after-school programs possible.

| All After-School Staff | 23.6 avg per month | 444.8 avg hours per month |
|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|

### Summer Programs

Just as there were more participants for more hours on the average in the summer months, there were more paid and non-paid staff working more hours to accommodate the youth.

13

Paid Staff: Summer months

| Sworn | 6.1 avg per month | 266.2 avg hours per month |
|---|---|---|
| Non-sworn | 12.3 avg per month | 1238.2 avg hours per month |
| All paid Staff | 18.4 avg per month | 1504.4 avg hours per month |

Volunteer Staff: Summer months

| Sworn | 14.2 avg per month | 231.2 avg hours per month |
|---|---|---|
| Non-sworn | 15.5 avg per month | 227.2 avg hours per month |
| All volunteer staff | 29.7 avg per month | 458.3 avg hours per month |

| All Summer Staff | 48.1 avg per month | 1962.7 avg hours per month |
|---|---|---|

Paid and Volunteer Staff: After-School and Summer Programs:

| All Staff all programs | 35.8 avg per month | 1203.7 avg hours per month |
|---|---|---|

**IMPACT AREAS**

### AREA 1: Program Satisfaction, Trust, Safety and Perceptions of the Police

The area of program satisfaction, trust, safety of the youth and police relations were dealt with primarily through the focus groups. The results of the focus groups are presented by sub population in the order of a) youth, b) law enforcement, c) parents, d) partners, e) teachers and f) civilian (non-sworn) staff. Further, for summary purposes, responses to the four areas were condensed into three. The trust questions were divided. The question concerning trust of the adults who run the program was moved to program satisfaction and the questions concerning trust of the police were considered along with the other questions about perceptions of the police.

The size of the focus groups ranged from 3 to 20. The overall number of individuals who participated across the five JBAS sites numbered 280. Specifically, there were 170 youth ranging in age from 8 to 17 years, 26 police officers, 14 community partners, 7 teachers, 48 parents and 13 program staff. Demographics of the youth can be found in Appendix C, Table 4, and demographics of the remaining groups may be found in Appendix C, Table 5.

## Responses from Participant Youth

Comparing Table 4 with Table 1, the 170 youngsters interviewed in the focus groups closely resembled the overall demographics developed for the totality of program participants. The gender ratio was virtually identical (53% male, 47% female in the focus groups v. 54% male, 46% female overall) as was the average age (12.16 years for focus group youth v. 12.55 years). The focus group sample did have fewer Caucasian (16% v. 23%) and more Hispanic (42% v. 26%) youth than that reflected in Table 1.

The main findings were:

@Youth were very positive about the programs and trusted the staff

@Youth felt if it were not for the programs they would be home alone, home babysitting younger siblings, or on the streets because there was no one at home

@Youth felt that if not for the JBAS Programs they would not have had the opportunity to participate in any of these activities

@Youth reported that what they liked best about the programs was the respect given them and the discipline required

@Youth reported they learned to follow the rules, discipline, respect for others, communication skills and how not to fight

@While the youth felt quite safe, they felt safest when police were around

@The vast majority of youth trusted the law enforcement officers they knew and felt that in general they trusted the police more since being in the program because they got to know officers personally. Those who expressed negative feelings generally had a parent or sibling or friend arrested.

@Youth did not want to be police officers because the job was too dangerous and you could get killed. Otherwise, what they did want to be was typical of this age group - doctor, nurse, teacher, lawyer, engineer, movie star, sports star, rock star.

**Program Satisfaction**: For the issue of program satisfaction, **the youth** were asked what types of programs they were involved in; what made them decide to participate; what they liked best and least about the programs; what they learned from the programs; and what they would change about the programs. They reported having participated in a broad and diverse array of programs which included: baseball, basketball, football, soccer, swimming, computers, game room, pool, NYSP camp, arts and crafts, movies, board games, table tennis, volleyball, golf, bowling, boxing, softball, cheerleading, video making, G.R.E.A.T., and mentoring. The common theme was that the JBAS sites offered them an opportunity to be involved in these activities, and if

these JBAS sites were not available, they may not have gotten the opportunity to participate in these types of programs.

They also had an array of unique reasons for becoming involved in these programs:

- _ My mom sent me
- _ I have nothing else to do
- _ My foster mom works late
- _ It's really fun
- _ I don't want to stay home and get into trouble
- _ It keeps me away from drugs
- _ I won't get involved with gangs
- _ I want to grow up and be someone
- _ I never played sports before
- _ My brother was involved
- _ I always wanted to be a cheerleader but wasn't selected by my school
- _ It's free
- _ You get trophies
- _ They treat us right (the staff)
- _ My dad/grandfather coaches a team
- _ I want to be better at sports
- _ They make me do my homework and I do better in school
- _ I learn new things and meet new people
- _ I like the competition
- _ Free food
- _ I want to learn about computers and I don't have one at home

Furthermore, all of the youth indicated that they would continue to be involved in the programs. What they liked best about the programs was individualized and represented many different activities. However, a consistent theme was that they liked best the respect and discipline given to them, and that they learned the importance of following rules. In response to "What do you like least?" the overall response was "nothing, we like everything." While some of the youth indicated they didn't like having to do homework, they agreed that homework was very important.

The overall response to what they had learned was discipline, respect, communication, and being a team member. They indicated they learned that rules have to be followed; that it is okay not to like someone, but you still needed to respect them; that if you are mad at someone you should try to communicate with them and not use your fists. They learned how to stay out of trouble, how to help their community, and to have respect for different cultures.

The overwhelming response to the question, "If you were in charge of running the program(s), would you do anything different?" was that they would not change a thing, with the exception of having more equipment available and more travel outside of their neighborhoods.

**Safety:** For the issue of their personal safety, **the youth** indicated that their programs had been held at schools, parks, community centers, precincts, Boys and Girls Clubs, PAL Centers, etc. Overwhelmingly, they felt safe at these locations because there were coaches and/or police around. A few indicated that they felt unsafe because of the bullies at these locations. In response, a member of a baseball team said they look after one another and the fact that they had bats made him feel safe.

The youth were split in response to whether they felt safe in their neighborhoods. About half felt safe in their neighborhood because they always saw police, while the other half said there were too many shooting, gangs, and bullies. Almost all felt safe in their schools, with the exception that they felt uncomfortable when a stranger would use the school bathroom.

All of the youth felt that they could trust the adults who run the programs, and a bond was created in which the children felt that if "something bad" happened, they could tell these adults.

**Perceptions of the Police**: Both the focus groups and a survey were used to gather data concerning perceptions of the police. In the focus groups, **the youth** revealed that they felt they could totally trust the police officers involved in the programs. When asked about their relationship with the police officers assigned to their schools, those who had police officers at their schools felt that they could trust them. When they were asked if they could trust the police officers assigned to their neighborhoods, approximately two-thirds felt a high level of trust, however, one third felt that they really didn't know the officers or the officers did not do enough in their neighborhoods to make it a safe place to live and that they were slow in responding to calls in their neighborhood.

When asked if their opinion about police officers changed since being involved in the JBAS program, all of the children who had police officers involved in their programs felt that they could trust the police more because they had gotten to personally know a police officer.

The youth were also asked how their friends felt about police officers. A common theme in their responses was that if their friends were good and stayed out of trouble, they generally like police, while the friends who were in trouble or belonged to gangs, did not like the police.

The majority said that they really didn't know their neighbors; therefore, they were unable to determine how their neighbors felt about the police.

The majority of the youth felt that their parents/grandparents/guardians liked the police, although a few indicated that their parents etc. did not like the police because they (the adult) had been taken to jail by the police, or a relative had been arrested.

Interestingly, when asked if they would consider becoming a police officer, the vast majority indicated that the job was too dangerous and the chances of being killed were

quite good. However, this response could have been affected by the events of September 11. All the youth indicated that they were aware of the event as it had been discussed in school, at home and in the JBAS programs. Many of the youth said they wanted careers in which they could help people, but not be killed. The most common careers mentioned were doctor, nurse, teacher, lawyer, sports star, military, engineer, hairdresser, movie star, rock star.

In the fall of 2001, 88 youngsters from four sites responded to survey questions concerning trust in the police. These questions were included with the Self-Esteem Post Test. Almost every child who responded to the survey indicated they trusted the police to help when someone was in trouble: 93% of the time for themselves, 98% of the time for a parent, and 94% of the time for a sibling. Complete data may be found in Appendix D, Table 6.

## Responses from Law Enforcement Officers

The main findings were:

@Officers were generally quite satisfied with the program

@Officers had excellent rapport with the civilian staff and worked well together

@Officers believed the programs kept the youth out of trouble

@Six themes described what the officers' liked best about the programs and their motivations for becoming involved in youth programming: giving back, getting to know the youth better, helping kids, improving the police image, have fun, and that they were recruited

@Officers were frustrated because they could not save all the kids

@Officers felt the programs enabled the youth to trust them and that the programs also built trust with parents and the community as a whole. The interactions enabled the youth and their parents to see that cops were people too. They were cautious about indicating that trust transferred to other officers or law enforcement in general.

@The length of time the association lasted and the officer's personality appeared to be the factors associated with establishing positive relationships between the youth and police officers

**Program Satisfaction**: The **police officers** who participated in the focus groups indicated they had been involved in a wide variety of the programs at each site including basketball, baseball, explorers, fishing, golf, bowling, weightlifting, football,

soccer, mentoring, summer camp, the Gang Resistance Education and Training program (G.R.E.A.T.), etc., and were generally well satisfied with the programs.

Most of the officers who had full time assignments associated with youth programming had requested those assignments, and many (assigned and volunteers alike) had completed special training in working with youth. What the officers liked best and their reasons for becoming involved in youth programming and the JBAS programs in particular were as individual as the officers themselves, but did seem to revolve around six themes; no one being more important than another.

First was the idea of "giving back." Several of the officers had been PAL kids themselves and were quick to point out how the program changed their lives and enabled them to make positive life choices.

Second was "getting to know the youth better." Many officers felt that their interactions with youth were strained partly because they did not know who the kids were as people. Spending time with the youth in positive ways enabled them to learn about them as people. Even the SRO's who saw many of the youth during the day at school, believed the after-school interactions gave them new insights into the youth's thoughts and beliefs, and brought them closer to the youth. "Having built the rapport in this way makes my interactions with them during the school day or when we meet on the street much easier."

Third, and closely associated with the second theme, was "helping children." All the officers involved in JBAS, including the SRO's, had spent several years on the street where their only interactions with young people were negative. As one officer put it, "I was sick of arresting them. I thought there had to be a better way." Other responses included giving them a sense of accomplishment, helping children stay out of trouble, the opportunity to work with at-risk kids, to enable kids to experience things outside their neighborhoods (broaden their horizons), and the intrinsic rewards one gets when working with kids. Both Hispanic and Asian officers specifically mentioned the opportunity to mentor children within their own culture who are having trouble assimilating.

The fourth theme was "to improve the image of police among young people." Responses here included "letting kids know you are human, too" and "changing the kids' perceptions and attitudes about the police. "

Fifth was the notion of "It's just plain fun!" "Where else can I get paid for playing my favorite sport with some of the best potential players in town?" Also mentioned was the opportunity to teach kids to appreciate sports and what teamwork is all about, and to appreciate being outdoors and the wonders of nature. The latter referred to fishing, camping and nature hikes.

19

Finally, often mentioned was the persuasive power of other officers, including the Chief -- "He's a hard man to say no to, and once I said yes I have never been sorry."

As mentioned earlier and reflected in Tables 2 and 3, parts 2 and 3, officers worked the programs on duty, off duty (special detail/overtime) or as volunteers. However, some of the officers assigned to a division other than PAL, indicated that not all supervisors provided the same level of support for PAL.

What the officers liked least about being involved was the frustration in knowing you cannot save all the kids, and having to discipline and suspend children from the program for a time, just to send a message that certain behaviors will not be tolerated. Internal frustrations included allowing officers not assigned to the PAL unit to receive overtime for their participation, while officers assigned to PAL unit had to flex their hours, and law enforcement agencies' general lack of funding for long-term solutions to juvenile crime such as committing additional resources for PAL or other after-school programs.

Officers indicated that if they were "in charge" of the programs they would make the following changes: incentives for the officers involved in the programs, educate other officers as to the importance of PAL, provide better equipment and playing fields, and require every officer to do community service hours in youth oriented programs.

The officers also believed these types of programs were reducing the youths' involvement in violence, drug use, and gang-affiliation, as evidenced in the statement that "These programs give children an alternative to being on the street: the programs help keep them out of trouble; sports and activities are a tool to keep kids focused on success; the programs teach decision making and consequences for actions; and enable children to develop confidence."

The officers indicated relationships with the non-sworn civilian staff members were very good, yet the amount of interaction was sometimes limited due to programs being geographically dispersed.

**Safety of the Youth**: **The officers** indicated that they had participated in programs that were held at schools, parks, community centers, fields, Boys and Girls Clubs, YWCA and that the children felt safe at these locations because of the uniform presence.

The officers also felt that it depended upon the particular neighborhood, and to some degree the young person, as to whether or not the youth felt safe in that neighborhood, and that schools that had officers assigned to them (SRO's) created a greater feeling of a safe environment for the youth than those which did not.

**Perceptions of the Police**: **The officers** believed the youth perceived them in a positive light. All of the officers believed that there was a high level of trust between

themselves and the youth. The bond created between the officers and the children resulted in the officers being viewed as a father/mother, mentor, friend, and then a police officer. One of the children wrote a school paper and shared it with the officer. This paper described the officer as the most influential person in the child's life. The officers felt their role in the program was crucial because many of the children don't have someone to talk to at home due to a variety of circumstances including working parents and/or parents absent from the home for other reasons.

The officers also felt their relationship with the youth as a result of participating in the after-school programs was a segue to enabling these same youth to perceive their neighborhood police officers as trustworthy. However, the neighborhood officers had limited time to interact with the youth due to calls for service. Time and the officer's personality appeared to be the factors associated with establishing positive relationships between the youth and police officers.

Finally, the officers believed that after-school programs help build community trust, not only with the children, but also with their parents. Through interaction, perceptions can be changed, and in many cases by getting to know the officer, the children, their parents, and the community embraced a more positive perception of police. The officers felt that interaction enables both the children and parents to see that cops are real people too.

### Responses from Parents

The main findings were:

@Parents indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the programs and the staff

@Parents reported that two of the biggest issues for them were safety and cost

@Parents felt the children were in safe environments and that safety was increased by the police presence

@Parents saw positive changes in their children in terms of general behavior, grades, willingness to take responsibility, self-esteem, respect for others, etc.

@Parents liked the idea that the children were not only learning but had the opportunity to see police in a positive light

@About half the parents indicated their attitudes toward law enforcement in general had improved. All agreed it depended on the officer and the extent of the interaction. They looked at officers who worked with youth as having special talents

**Program Satisfaction**: The 48 **parents** who participated in the focus groups reported having 80 children currently active in JBAS programs, and having 42 others who had been involved at some time in the past. Parents indicated their children were involved in one or more of the programs listed earlier. Some participation was seasonal and specific (e.g. baseball), while other participation was virtually year round, reflecting both the needs of the parents and the desires of the youth.

Parents indicated a high level of trust in the staff members and police officers who were involved in the programs.

What parents liked best about the programs and the reasons they wanted their children to participate were the same: learn sports; make friends; learn teamwork; learn discipline; build self-esteem; participate in field trips; learn values; learn about other cultures; learn about computers; no cost for programs; it is a safe environment ("I feel better leaving them with police officers"); and enable their children to have an opportunity to get to know police officers. That the programs were safe and free were particularly important. The youth simply would not have been allowed to participate otherwise. Parents at two sites specifically mentioned that they appreciated the fact that no child would be left alone -- if a parent was late picking them up, someone was always there waiting with the child, or would see to it that the child arrived home safely.

Parents least liked and consistently felt that improvements could be made in having more programs for children 15 years of age and older, larger gym facilities and better outdoor lighting on the fields. The age issue had to do with desiring activities for those youth unable to make the sports teams in the upper grades and/or unable to afford non-school league play.

Discipline, sports, respect for diversity, patience, and teamwork were cited as the prominent things their children learned from being involved in the programs.

Parents were enthusiastic in describing the positive changes they had seen in their children's behavior as a result of program participation and noted positive changes in politeness, social skills, better grades in school, cleaner bedrooms, willingness to be responsible, greater self-esteem, understanding their obligation to others and greater respect for family, elders, police and coaches. Parents liked the idea that all programs required good grades to participate and/or focused on helping with homework. "He makes sure his grades are OK so he can participate" was a common remark.

Parents indicated that if they were in charge of the programs they would initiate more programs for children 15 years of age and older; initiate programs for children with special needs; advertise the programs more; utilize the older teenagers to serve as mentors; and require the parents to become more involved in the programs.

**Safety of the Youth**: Parents indicated that their children had participated in programs held at many different venues and felt their children were safe at these locations due to the presence of staff and police officers. All the parents felt that a police presence contributed to an increased feeling of safety both for them and the children. For the parents, important issues were deterring drug dealers, gang members and others (including other violent children) who might target their children.

There was a mixed response as to whether the parents felt their children were safe in their neighborhoods. However, the vast majority of parents felt their children were safe in their schools.

**Perceptions of the Police**: The parents felt that while there was a high level of trust and respect for the officers who worked the programs and those who worked in the schools, there was a mixed response to whether this translated to the neighborhoods or police in general. For some, neighborhood officers were seen as friends, however, this level of trust depended on who the officer was and how much interaction the parents have had with that officer. About half the parents indicated that their opinion about police in general had changed positively because they had the opportunity to see another side of a police officer – a kinder, more friendly individual.

The majority of parents felt that their friends and neighbors had a positive perception about police. This seemed to be heightened/reinforced by the terrorist tragedy on September 11, and the unselfish response of law enforcement.

## Responses from Partners

The main findings were:

@All of the partners were committed to continuing to support these programs

@Partners stated they absolutely trusted the staff and police involved

@The partners were encouraged to become involved by seeing the positive results that the programs deliver

@Partners were frustrated by the large number of organizations and corporations not interested in supporting youth-oriented programming

@The partners felt that the community has mixed emotions about police, and this perception varies from neighborhood to neighborhood, from citizen to citizen

**Program Satisfaction**: The **Partners** indicated that they supported the entire

concept of the programs, and had been involved with all aspects. They indicated that they absolutely trusted the organizations that provide these programs and the staff members and police who are involved in the programs.

The partners wanted to become involved after seeing the positive results that the programs deliver. Some became involved by serving on boards or supporting the programs monetarily. The partners enjoyed best the opportunity to be a part of programs that benefited the quality of life of the children residing in their communities. All of the partners were committed to continuing to support these programs.

They recognized the array of resources and organizations whose cooperation was necessary to initiate and maintain youth-oriented programs, but were frustrated by the reluctance of many corporations and community resources to become involved in supporting youth-oriented programs.

If the partners were in charge of running the programs, they indicated that they would expand the programs, focus on additional programs oriented towards females, and try to help the officers spend less time on administrative program issues.

**Safety of the Youth**: The partners indicated that they believed these programs offered the children a safe environment, and that having police officers involved in the programs increased the safety of not only the children, but also their parents and other spectators.

**Perceptions of the Police**: The partners felt that their opinion about police had been changed from being involved with these programs. The partners had a greater level of respect for what services the police offered the community and the diverse role the police play from enforcer of laws to quality of life issues such as these youth-oriented programs.

The partners felt that the community has mixed emotions about police, and this perception varies from neighborhood to neighborhood, from citizen to citizen. Some communities trust the police, while other communities may fear the police. The partners believed that one way for the police to change community perception is to be more active in addressing the concerns of individual communities, and continuing to be involved in programs such as JBAS. The partners felt that through being involved with these programs, the police can have an effect on the communities' perceptions.

## Responses from Teachers

The main findings were:

@Teachers were impressed that the children wanted to attend the programs, knowing

they would be challenged to complete their homework before they could play or do other activities

@Teachers reported many positive changes in the youths behavior in the classroom

**Program Satisfaction**: Because of differences across sites, some **teachers** had actually participated in the programs while others had not, but were aware of their students who were participating. All were satisfied with the programs, the staff and the law enforcement officers.

For those who actually participated, what they liked best was interacting with the children in a relaxed setting and the structure of the program. All liked that it stressed academics. They also liked watching the attitudes change from "I can't do this" to "Come on everybody, lets do this!" They also liked the idea that it was giving the children some supervised safe activities after school when there was nothing else available for them.

The teachers believed the children learned self-discipline, respect and had a better attitude toward themselves. If in charge, the teachers indicated that they would try to find additional space and more activities.

Teachers also reported that they noticed many positive changes in the youths behavior in the classroom as a result of being in the programs. For example, the youth were not disruptive in the classroom, while homework was discussed. This was because, thanks to the programs, the youth had attempted their homework even if it was not completed and could, therefore, participate fully in the discussion. The affected youth were even helping other kids with homework and their self-esteem improved.

**Safety of the Youth**: Teachers felt the youth were in a safe environment, made safer by the presence of law enforcement.

**Perceptions of the Police:** As far as the teachers were concerned, the fact that children learned that officers were "OK people" was a more important an issue than their safety. The teachers liked the fact that the police were helping and were seen in a helping role. Their behavior was such that had they not been in uniform, it would have been impossible to tell they were police officers.

Teachers reported that their personal attitudes toward police had changed for the better, but were not sure about their neighbors or friends. The personal attitudes depended on the type of interactions which occurred between the individuals and the officers.

**Responses from the Civilian (non-sworn) Staff**

The main findings were:

@Staff liked best working with children, changing attitudes, teaching, the gratitude of the children and the sheer joy the children expressed

@What staff members liked least was the bureaucracy and politics

@Staff members felt that the children learned respect, discipline, teamwork, and goal setting

@Staff saw children using conflict resolution skills instead of fighting

@Staff believed police are role models, are concerned about the children and their communities, and are the perfect addition to an after-school program


**Program Satisfaction: Staff** had been involved in all aspects of the programs and indicated they had selected this employment because of: the interaction with the children; the rewards of working with youth; the creativity involved in programming; the similarity to social work; belief in prevention efforts; opportunity to fund-raise and promote the programs; the "hugs you get" from the children and the look of sheer joy on their faces.

What staff members liked best about the programs were changing children's attitudes, bonding with the children, the challenges of working with children, and the gratitude from the children.

What staff members liked least was the bureaucracy and politics associated with the job, having to discipline the children, and parents complaining about the programs.

Staff members felt that the children learned respect, discipline, teamwork, and goal setting from being involved in the programs. Additionally, staff members observed changes in the children's behavior which included: the ability to apply conflict resolution skills instead of violence or threats; discipline both physically and mentally; and respect for others and their property.

Staff members would like to see changes in their programs to include: more money allocated to the programs; more and better equipment; and more police officer involvement to include the upper level staff members of the law enforcement agencies.

**Safety of the Youth**: Staff felt all venues were safe and when police officers were involved in the programs, the children had an increased feeling of being in a safe environment.

**Perceptions of the Police**: From being involved in the programs, staff members felt a higher level of trust with the police officers assigned to both the schools and their neighborhoods. From the partnership between the staff members and the police, staff members felt an increase in mutual respect for each other's contributions to the children.

Staff members believed that overall their friends, neighbors, and communities had a positive perception about police. Staff members did note that sometimes a single officer can influence a community's perception, and at times, this perception could be either positive or negative. Staff members did feel that police officers are respected and have good character, are role models, are concerned about the children and their communities, and are the perfect addition to an after-school program.

### AREA 2: Academic Performance and Problems in School

When after-school programs emphasize homework and mentoring:

@Both academic and behavior grades improved significantly over time.

@Program participants received significantly higher grades both academically and behaviorally than a matched group.

Efforts were made to obtain data from the many school systems serving the program youth. These included personal visits to principals, teachers, school district administrators and others at all levels at each site by the evaluators and site personnel. Data sought included attendance, behavioral problems, disciplinary reports and outcomes (suspension, etc), and academic performance. Data were sought for both program youth and others who could be used as "controls." Issues of confidentiality, record availability, and record compatibility limited our success. We were successful, however, at two sites: Stamford and Lawrence. Both programs have a strong emphasis on homework and mentoring.

In Stamford, both academic and conduct (behavior) grades were obtained for program participants for three of the four marking periods of the 2000-2001 school year. The first two periods were designated as "Start or Pre" and the fourth marking period as "End or Post." Grades were based on four subjects that were consistent across grades: Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. Data were obtained on 90 individuals.

Academically, the Stamford program youth's GPA began at 2.34 and ended at 2.79, a statistically significant increase. Conduct grades also improved significantly from 3.51 to 3.68 (see Table 7, Appendix D).

In Lawrence, we were not only fortunate enough to obtain both academic and conduct grades for 73 program youth, but we were also able to obtain similar information for a matched group of youth from the same schools (155 of the matched group of 175 had academic grades, all had conduct grades). The same academic subjects mentioned above were used, and groups were compared for the last marking period of the 2000-2001 school year.

For the final marking period, program participants had significantly higher academic grades than the comparison group (3.59 v 2.42) and significantly higher conduct grades as well (3.77 v. 2.78). Table 7 in Appendix D provides details of these analyses as well.

These results are consistent with teacher comments obtained in the focus groups indicating that completed homework immediately changes classroom behavior. Statements included "They have no reason to misbehave" and "They can be part of the discussion now."

### AREA 3: Delinquency

@Although the sample size of 265 record searches is not as large as we would have liked, the data available does indicate that after-school program participation did reduce criminal behavior.

Efforts similar to those associated with School Data were also made to obtain criminal history data on program participants, both by the evaluators and by the staff at each site. These included personal visits to the Chief law enforcement officers at each site by the evaluators and site personnel and numerous other contacts. We were successful in three cities: Lawrence, Stamford and Indianapolis. Lists of program participants were provided to law enforcement who researched the criminal histories and reported back the dates of offenses. Criminal histories were completed between September and December 2002.

The data were divided by date to correspond to the time period before the program began (Pre Program), while the program was operating (During) and after the program was over (Post Program). Specific programs began and ended at different times and that was taken into account. These data are summarized below:

Arrest Data

| Site | Pre Program | During | Post Program |
|------|-------------|--------|--------------|
| Stanford (n=90) | 12 youth/ 26 chgs | 2 youth/ 3 chgs | 0 / 0 |
| Indy (n=95) | 20 / 28 | 7 / 7 | 0 / 0 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lawrence* (n=80) | 0 / 0 | 0 / 0 | 7 / 7 |
| Total | 32 / 54 | 9 / 10 | 7 / 7 |
| Percent of 265 | 12.1% | 3.4% (2.3%**) | 2.6% |

* only charges were reported, we assume 1 person per charge.
** 3 individuals who offended "Pre Program" also offended "During". The lower percent removes them.

From these data it would appear that participation in the program did reduce juvenile arrests (12% v. 3%).

While we would like to state unequivocally that participation in these after-school programs significantly reduced participation in criminal activity, such a statement will have to wait until better data are available. The present data are limited in two ways. First, the level of participation in the various programs could NOT be related to arrests. Youth varied in their program participation from daily to once a month or less throughout the months designated as "during", and we had no way of knowing if the arrested individuals were participating in one or more of the summer programs available (the "Post" period). Second, controls were not available.

### AREA 4: Self-Esteem

@Significant improvements in self-esteem were recorded among program participants

One of the objectives common across sites was the desire to increase the personal feelings of self worth in the youth served. At risk/disadvantaged youth often have low self-esteem which has been cited as one reason they are more likely to do poorly in school, are easily lead, get into trouble both in and out of school and are vulnerable to gang membership. In order to assess program impact in terms of self-esteem, each site was asked to unsystematically select approximately 50 youth for a paper and pencil self-esteem test and three months later give those same youth the same test again. The test used was Hudson's (1982) Index of Self-Esteem (ISE). The range of scores on this instrument = 0 to 100.

Three months was chosen for several reasons; first because many of the programs were of short duration, second because of the difficulty of locating the same youth over extended periods of time, and the months selected also corresponded to the first semester of the school year during which all sites had active JBAS funded after-school programs. Equally important for the present purpose was the fact that this time period would provide a mix of youth both old and new to the after-school programs.

Four sites chose to participate, giving the first of the pre tests September 12 , 2001 and the last of the post tests January 29, 2002. As anticipated, there were varying degrees of success in finding the same youth. Of the 50 pre tested at each site, the final numbers of those who were also post-tested were: Lawrence 24, Stamford 23, Indianapolis 36 and Portland 31, for a total of 114.

Significant gains in self-esteem were found. First administration scores ranged from 31 to 94, with an average of 63.57. The second administration scores ranged from 42 to 95, with a significantly higher average of 77.04. While the Pre Test

| Pre/Post | n | Mean | Range | t | df | p |
|----------|-----|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----|--------|
| Pre Post | 114 | 63.57 77.04 | 31 - 94 42 - 95 | 12.94 | 113 | <.0001 |

average implied a reasonable level of self worth at the outset, the second score demonstrated a significantly greater level, indicating that the youth felt significantly better about themselves after participating in the JBAS after-school programs.

This result is quite impressive given that the sample came about equally from the four cities (no city dominated to influence the results), the cities literally stretch from coast to coast and the cities represent quite diverse differences in the demographics of the youth and also represent quite diverse programming.


### AREA 5: Risk Taking Behavior - Part 1:Gang Involvement

@Respondents were generally not aware of gangs in their neighborhoods or schools, although significantly more boys than girls were. Almost none had siblings in gangs, although 26% had friends who were in gangs (again more boys than girls)

@76% said being in the program prevented them from being in a gang and 88% said being in the program helped them say no

@88% of those who were asked (15 of 17) said the program prevented them from joining a *neighborhood gang* and 94% (16 of 17) said it helped them say no

@79% of those who were asked (11 of 14) said being in the program prevented them from joining a *gang at school* and all of them (100%) said it helped them say no


An objective of the JBAS programs had to do with preventing gang membership. Since none of the many jurisdictions maintained electronic data on gang members and definitions of "gang member" differed, it was impossible to check names of program participants against such lists. Thus data on this objective was collected

by a series of questions which were included with the self-esteem post test (on the back actually). While only 88 of these provided usable data, the responses came equally from the four participating sites, the respondents were identical in age (12.3 years on average v 12.6); and, although there were somewhat more males (63% v. 56%), we feel comfortable that the results are representative. The results are summarized here. Complete data can be found in Tables 8 and 9 in Appendix D.

As indicated on Table 8, about half (42%) said they WERE aware of gangs in their neighborhoods, while 72% said they were NOT aware of gangs in their schools. A significantly greater proportion of the boys (35.8%) than girls (15.6%) reported being aware of gangs in their schools. We would expect more gang activity in the neighborhoods than the middle schools and also that the males would be more aware.

Almost none of the respondents indicated having a sibling in a gang (95% said no), and the majority also reported not having friends who were gang members (73%). Here again, there was a strong trend for boys to report gang friends (32.7%) more than girls (15.2%). This would be consistent with the previous results.

Respondents were asked if they had ever been asked to join a gang, either in the neighborhood or at school. Most (80%) said no to the neighborhood question and 84% said no to the school gang question.

When asked if participation in the program had PREVENTED them from being in a gang, 76% said YES at least part of the time, and 52% said all of the time. Only 24% said no. When asked if program participation had HELPED them say no to gang membership, a slightly stronger response was recorded. 87.5% said YES at least part of the time and 68% said all of the time. A smaller percentage (12.5%) said no.

Shown in Table 9, Crosstabs were run using the 17 who said they had been asked to join a neighborhood gang and the 14 who said they had been recruited at school with the two questions about the program. 15 of the 17 (88%) who were asked to join a neighborhood gang reported that being in the program prevented them from doing so and 16 of the 17 (94%) said that being in the program helped them to say no. Similar data were obtained regarding school gangs, in that 11 of the 14 (79%) said being in the program prevented them from being in a gang and all 14 (100%) reported that being in the program helped them say no.

## CONCLUSIONS

The JBAS/PAL pilot programs were in the main successful and accomplished

their objectives. They engaged large numbers of both male and female targeted at-risk middle school youth during high-risk hours with interesting and challenging activities in safe environments, made safer by the presence of law enforcement. They engaged a wide variety of individuals in a wide variety of venues. They stressed personal growth and achievement in academics, cultural activities, recreation and sports. They involved great numbers of both individuals and organizations as partners and harnessed public and private resources. They exposed youth to police officers in positive roles. The programs were creative in their delivery of services and provided a variety of approaches from which to choose for those who wish to enrich existing programs or initiate new ones.

For the months covered by this report, the JBAS Program paid for the combined talents of an average of 23.6 individuals each month, who put in 444.8 hours on average each month to make some 40,176 hours of after-school programming possible. Including the summer programming, the totals were an average of 35.8 persons per month spending, an average of 1203.7 average hours per month to provide some 102,587 hours of contact with youth.

As a result,

@ Academic and behavior grades improved significantly over time

@ Program participants earned significantly higher grades in academics and behavior than did a matched control group

@After-school program participation reduced criminal behavior

@ Significant improvements in self-esteem were recorded

@ 76% of the youth said being in the program prevented them from being in a gang and 88% said being in the program helped them say no to gang membership

@ Very little substance abuse was reported

@ Parents, youth, partners, and teachers all indicated a high level of satisfaction with the programs, the staff and the officers

@ Youth were seen to exhibit positive behavior changes both in and out of school. They were seen to have better social skills, better grades, a willingness to take responsibility, self discipline, more respect for others, more respect for themselves and more confidence in themselves

@ While everyone reported better attitudes toward the police involved with the programs, youth were more willing to generalize these positive feelings to the

neighborhood or to police in general than were adults

@ The extent of the involvement and the officer's personality appeared to be the factors associated with establishing positive relationships

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Find additional funding to continue and expand these programs, not only in the pilot cities, but in others as well.

2. Re-structure future funding formulas so that funding is not removed so dramatically. Full funding was only available for one year, with 30% the second and none following. This scenario required the sites to be actively searching for additional funding at the

same time they were gearing up, opening and running the after-school programs. There were often conflicts as the very partners who sites were joining with to conduct the programs would be the same individuals and organizations pursued for future funding. Practically, the two things could not be accomplished at the same time.

We would recommend a five year approach with full funding the first two years, 70% the third, 40% the fourth, 20% the fifth and none the 6th, to provide a smooth transition to self sufficiency and to provide time for the partners to experience the positive results of the programs. Alternately, a three-year plan would be: 100%, 70%, 40%.

3. a) Provide additional funds for evaluation and b) change the funding cycle so that funds are available to the sites in April with no expectation of programming to begin until the following September. This prevents program start up time from being deducted from the school year when programs are supposed to be in full operation. It also allows for the collection of baseline data and for data gathering systems to be designed and put into operation before the programs actually begin.

The cycle in effect for this project only allowed for three months of after-school programming during the first year, and since there was no money for evaluation after the first year, forced the evaluation of the programs to be limited to these three months.

Either of the recommended systems would provide several school years upon which to assess impact.

---

## REFERENCES

Halpern, R. (1999). After-school programs for low income children: Promise and challenges. The Future of Children, 9 (2), 81-134

Hudson, W.W. (1982). The clinical measurement package: A field manual. Homewood, IL. Dorsey Press.

Schorr, L. (1998). Within our reach. New York. Anchor Press/Doubleday

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1995). Changing lives: Programs that make a difference for youth at high risk. DHHS Publication No. 95-3043. Washington, D.C. Author.

# APPENDIX A

Participant Data Base Item List

Monthly Report of Activities example worksheet

Focus Group Questions
       Questions for Kids
       Questions for Parents/Staff
       Questions for Partners
       Questions for Police
       Questions for Teachers

February 25, 2001

## *SUGGESTED ORGANIZATION FOR A PAPER FILE ON PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS*

For those who do not choose to enter these data electronically in Excel on the disk provided (will also work w/ Access, etc), you can accomplish the task using **one folder for each child.**

There would be at least **six individual sheets of paper** in this folder, corresponding to each set of information needed, as:

1 sheet for DEMOGRAPHICS -     age, date of birth, gender, ethnicity, parent's names, addresses, etc.

1 sheet for PROGRAM NAMES AND DATES OF ATTENDANCE - each program the child attended, the dates of attendance & hours of participation would be recorded

1 sheet for SCHOOL DATA - grade reports, disciplinary reports, attendance, etc

1 sheet for CRIMINAL JUSTICE DATA - arrests, FIR's, convictions, etc

1 sheet for "EXTRACURRICULAR" ACTIVITY DATA - what else the child was involved in aside from JBAS programs as you know about them

1 sheet for SELF ESTEEM etc SCORES

Additional sheets as desired by your site. (Permission slips from parents, school release forms, etc)

| | | Monthly Report of Activities -example worksheet | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

January, 2001

## Number of Participants & their Hours

| Program Name: | Old Participants | | New this Month | | Old+New | Old+New |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| Popular Dance | 15 | 60 | 20 | 80 | 35 | 140 |
| Folk Dance | | | | | | |
| Chorus | | | | | | |
| Instr/Jazz Band | | | | | | |
| Computer Class | | | | | | |
| Mentoring | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Totals | | | | | | |

January, 2001

**Paid Staff**

| Sworn | Sworn | Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | 20 | 3 | 480 | 4 | 500 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

January, 2001

**Volunteer Staff** — **All Staff**

| Sworn | Sworn | Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 40 | 15 | 1200 | 19 | 1240 | 23 | 1700 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FOCUS GROUP FOR KIDS**


Program Satisfaction

1. What program(s) have you been involved in?
2. What made you decide to participate in the program(s)?
3. What did you like best about the program(s)?
4. What did you like least about the program(s)?
5. What did you learn from the program(s)?
6. If you were in charge of running the program(s), would you do anything different?


Personal Safety

1. Where has the program(s) you participated in been held at?
2. Do you feel safe at this location?
3. Do you feel more or less safe when police officers are involved in the program(s)?
4. Do you feel safe in your neighborhood?
5. Do you feel safe at your school?


Trust

1. Do you trust the adults that run the program(s)?
2. Do you trust the police officers that are involved in the program(s)?
3. Do you trust the police officer(s) in your school?
4. Do you trust the police officers in your neighborhood?
5. Has your opinion about police officers changed since being involved in the program(s)?


Police Relations/Perceptions

1. How do your friends feel about police officers?
2. How do your neighbors feel about police officers?
3. How do your parents/grandparents/guardian feel about police officers?
4. Would you like to become a police officer?

# FOCUS GROUP FOR PARENTS AND STAFF MEMBERS

## Program Satisfaction

1. P: What program(s) have your child been involved in?
   S: What program(s) have you been involved in?
2. P: Why did you decide to have your child participate in this program?
   S: Why did you decide to participate in this program?
3. What did you like best about the program(s)?
4. What did you like least about the program(s)?
5. P: What did your child learn from the program?
6. P: How did the program(s) change your child's behavior?
7. If you were in charge of running the program(s), would you do anything different?

## Personal Safety

1. Where have the program(s) referred to above been held?
2. P: Do you feel your children are safe there?
   S: Do you feel safe there?
3. P: Was safety a concern in your child's participation?
4. P: Do you feel more or less safe for your child when police officers are Involved in the program(s)?
   S: Do you feel more or less safe when police officers are Involved in the program(s)?
5. P: Do you feel your child is safe in their neighborhoods?
6. P: Do you feel your child is safe at school?

## Trust

1. P: Do you trust the adults that run the program(s)?
2. Do you trust the police officers who are involved in the program(s)?
3. P: Do you trust the police officers in your child's school?
4. Do you trust the police officers in your neighborhood?
5. Has you opinion about police officers changed since your child has been involved in these program(s)?

## Police Relations/Perceptions

1. How do you feel about police officers?
2. How do your friends feel about police officers?
3. How do your neighbors feel about police officers?

**FOCUS GROUP FOR PARTNERS**

Program Satisfaction

    1.      What program(s) have you been involved in or supported?
    2.      What influenced you to be involved in or support the program(s)?
    3.      What did you like best about the program(s)?
    <u>4.</u>      What did you like least about the program(s)?
    5.      If you were in charge of running the program(s), would you do anything different?
    6.      Do you intend to continue supporting the program(s)?

Personal Safety

    1.      Do you feel this program offers a child a safe environment?
    2.      Do you feel having police officers involved in the program(s)
            Creates a safer environment for the children?

Trust

    1.      Do you trust the organization that provides these program(s)?
    6.      Do you trust the staff members?
    7.      Do you trust the police officers involved in the program(s)?
    8.      Has you opinion about police officers changed since your child has been involved in these program(s)?

Police Relations/Perceptions

    1.      In your opinion, how does the community feel about police officers?
    2.      How can police enhance the community's perception, relations and Trust?
    3.      Does the fact that your organization supports police involvement in after-school programs have any affect on the community's perception of police officers?

# FOCUS GROUP FOR POLICE

Program Satisfaction

1. What programs have you been involved in?
2. What made you decide to participate in the program(s)?
3. Were you on-duty or off-duty during your participation in the program(s)?
4. What did you like best about being involved in the program(s)?
5. What did you like least about being involved in the program(s)?
6. If you were in charge of running the program(s), would you do anything different?
7. Would you actively recruit your peers to become involved in a program? If so, why?


Personal Safety

1. Where has the program(s) you participated in been held at?
2. Do you think the children feel safe at this location?
3. Do you think children feel safer when police officers are involved in the program(s)?
4. Do you think having police officers involved in the program(s) have an effect on reducing the children's involvement in violence, drug use, and gang-affiliation?
5. In your opinion, do you think children feel safe in their neighborhoods?
6. In your opinion, do you think children feel safe in their schools?


Trust

1. Describe the relationship you have with the other program staff members?
2. Describe the relationship you have with the other police officers involved in the program?
3. In terms of the program(s) you have been involved in, describe the level of trust between the children in the program(s) and yourself?
4. In your opinion, describe how this interaction between police and the children involved in the after-school program has affected the level of trust between the same children and the police officers in the neighborhoods?
5. In your opinion, describe how this interaction between police and the children involved in the after-school program has affected the level of trust between the same children and the police officers in the schools?

Police Relations/Perceptions

1. In your opinion, how do the communities you have worked with feel about police officers?
2. In your opinion, when thinking about the children who have been involved in the program(s), do you think you have changed their perceptions about the police? Have you changed their parent(s)/guardians perceptions about police?
3. If you have changed the children's perceptions about police, to what degree do you think you have affected the children's perceptions about all police officers?

# FOCUS GROUP FOR TEACHERS

<u>Program Satisfaction</u>

1.      What program(s) have you been involved in or supported?
2.      What did you like best about the program(s)?
3.      If you were in charge of running the program(s), would you do anything different?

<u>Personal Safety</u>

1.      Do you feel this program offers a child a safe environment?
2.      Do you feel having police officers involved in the program(s) creates a safer environment for the children?

<u>Trust</u>

1.      How do you feel about the staff?
2.      How do you feel about the police?
3.      Has you opinion about police officers changed since being involved in these program(s)?

<u>Police Relations/Perceptions</u>

1.      How do you feel about police officers?
2.      How do your friends feel about police officers?
3.      How do your neighbors feel about police officers?

<u>Other</u>: ***********************

1.      Have you seen any change in the kids since they have been involved in the program(s) - has their participation improved their behavior in school, is it about the same, or has it gotten worse?
2.      What about their academic performance?

# APPENDIX B

Table 2, Parts 1, 2, 3:
Project Activity Totals by Month by Site - After School Programs

Table 3, Parts 1, 2, 3:
Project Activity Totals by Month by Site - Summer Months and Overall

| APPENDIX B | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Table** | **2** | | | |

| PROJECT TOTALS BY MONTH BY SITE - AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| Part 1 | Number of Participants & their Hours | | | | | |
| | Current Participants | | New this Month | | Old+New | Old+New |
| | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| **After School Programs** | | | | | | |
| **Lawrence** Mar 01 | 99 | 712 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 712 |
| L- April | 93 | 704 | 3 | 24 | 96 | 728 |
| L-May | 84 | 168 | 10 | 20 | 94 | 188 |
| L-Sept | 0 | 0 | 60 | 1440 | 60 | 1440 |
| L-Oct | 60 | 1440 | 65 | 1560 | 125 | 3000 |
| **Monthly Average** | **67.2** | **604.8** | **27.6** | **608.8** | **94.8** | **1213.6** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Stamford** Mar 01 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 385 | 57 | 385 |
| S-April | 57 | 1220 | 8 | 167 | 65 | 1387 |
| S-May | 65 | 1077 | 26 | 352 | 91 | 1429 |
| S-Sept | 72 | 886 | 39 | 480 | 111 | 1366 |
| S-Oct | 111 | 2728 | 8 | 348 | 119 | 3076 |
| **Monthly Average** | **61.0** | **1182.2** | **27.6** | **346.4** | **88.6** | **1528.6** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Portland** Mar 01 | 134 | 2534 | 84 | 366 | 218 | 2900 |
| P-April | 187 | 2800 | 74 | 1091 | 261 | 3891 |
| P-May | 175 | 2394 | 28 | 207 | 203 | 2601 |
| P-Sept | 169 | 2567 | 62 | 377 | 231 | 2944 |
| P-Oct | 175 | 2469 | 58 | 599 | 233 | 3068 |
| **Monthly Average** | **168.0** | **2552.8** | **61.2** | **528.0** | **229.2** | **3080.8** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Minneapolis** April | 239 | 654 | 25 | 42 | 264 | 696 |
| Mn-May | 87 | 665 | 39 | 332 | 126 | 997 |
| Mn-Sept | 214 | 3612 | 8 | 45 | 222 | 3657 |
| Mn-Oct | 221 | 3094 | 39 | 134 | 260 | 3228 |
| **Monthly Average** | **190.3** | **2006.3** | **27.8** | **138.3** | **218.0** | **2144.5** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Indianapolis** Mar | 64 | 633 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 633 |
| Indy-April | 50 | 472 | 2 | 32 | 52 | 504 |
| Indy-May | 43 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 146 |
| Indy-Sept | 21 | 203 | 1 | 10 | 22 | 213 |
| Indy-Oct | 22 | 126 | 37 | 852 | 59 | 978 |
| **Monthly Average** | **40.0** | **316.0** | **8.0** | **178.8** | **48.0** | **494.8** |
| | | | | | | |
| **After School Avg** | **105.3** | **1332.4** | **30.4** | **360.1** | **135.7** | **1692.5** |
| | | | | | | |

| | Table | 2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROJECT TOTALS BY MONTH BY SITE - AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS** | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Part 2** | **Paid Staff** | | | | |
| | Sworn | Sworn | Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both |
| | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| **After School Programs** | | | | | |
| **Lawrence** Mar 01 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 480 | 3 | 480 |
| L- April | 0 | 0 | 3 | 480 | 3 | 480 |
| L-May | 0 | 0 | 4 | 520 | 4 | 520 |
| L-Sept | 0 | 0 | 3 | 72 | 3 | 72 |
| L-Oct | 0 | 0 | 7 | 288 | 7 | 288 |
| **Monthly Average** | **0.0** | **0.0** | **4.0** | **368.0** | **4.0** | **368.0** |
| | | | | | |
| **Stamford** Mar 01 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 528 | 9 | 535 |
| S-April | 7 | 74 | 12 | 740 | 19 | 814 |
| S-May | 8 | 187 | 15 | 1168 | 23 | 1355 |
| S-Sept | 8 | 110 | 9 | 533 | 17 | 643 |
| S-Oct | 10 | 194 | 10 | 760 | 20 | 954 |
| **Monthly Average** | **6.8** | **114.4** | **10.8** | **745.8** | **17.6** | **860.2** |
| | | | | | |
| **Portland** Mar 01 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 283 | 8 | 289 |
| P-April | 3 | 21 | 6 | 305 | 9 | 326 |
| P-May | 2 | 17 | 10 | 317 | 12 | 334 |
| P-Sept | 3 | 21 | 6 | 305 | 9 | 326 |
| P-Oct | 2 | 17 | 4 | 360 | 6 | 377 |
| **Monthly Average** | **2.2** | **16.4** | **6.6** | **314.0** | **8.8** | **330.4** |
| | | | | | |
| **Minneapolis** April | 3 | 13 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 25 |
| Mn-May | 1 | 1 | 7 | 45 | 8 | 46 |
| Mn-Sept | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 16 |
| Mn-Oct | 3 | 18 | 2 | 27 | 5 | 45 |
| **Monthly Average** | **1.8** | **8.0** | **3.5** | **25.0** | **5.3** | **33.0** |
| | | | | | |
| **Indianapolis** Mar | 12 | 60 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 74 |
| Indy-April | 9 | 23 | 4 | 16 | 13 | 39 |
| Indy-May | 16 | 48 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 56 |
| Indy-Sept | 16 | 48 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 56 |
| Indy-Oct | 9 | 33 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 42 |
| **Monthly Average** | **12.4** | **42.4** | **3.0** | **11.0** | **15.4** | **53.4** |
| | | | | | |
| **After School Avg** | **4.6** | **36.2** | **5.6** | **292.8** | **10.2** | **329.0** |

|  | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|  |  |  | Table | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | **PROJECT TOTALS BY MONTH BY SITE - AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS** | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part 3** |  |  | **Volunteer Staff** | | | | | **All Staff** |
|  | Sworn | Sworn | Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both |  |  |
|  | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| **After School Programs** | | | | | | | | |
| **Lawrence** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 60 | 6 | 540 |
| L- April | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 60 | 6 | 540 |
| L-May | 1 | 5 | 6 | 120 | 7 | 125 | 11 | 645 |
| L-Sept | 2 | 16 | 10 | 160 | 12 | 176 | 15 | 248 |
| L-Oct | 2 | 16 | 10 | 160 | 12 | 176 | 19 | 464 |
| **Monthly Avg** | **1.0** | **7.4** | **6.4** | **112.0** | **7.4** | **119.4** | **11.4** | **487.4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stamford** | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 541 |
| S-April | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 24 | 834 |
| S-May | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 28 | 1375 |
| S-Sept | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 21 | 663 |
| S-Oct | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 20 | 24 | 974 |
| **Monthly Avg** | **0.0** | **0.0** | **4.6** | **17.2** | **4.6** | **17.2** | **22.2** | **877.4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Portland** | 2 | 68 | 4 | 26 | 6 | 94 | 14 | 383 |
| P-April | 2 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 68 | 11 | 394 |
| P-May | 1 | 78 | 12 | 60 | 13 | 138 | 25 | 472 |
| P-Sept | 2 | 68 | 6 | 60 | 8 | 128 | 17 | 454 |
| P-Oct | 1 | 58 | 4 | 52 | 5 | 110 | 11 | 487 |
| **Monthly Avg** | **1.6** | **68.0** | **5.2** | **39.6** | **6.8** | **107.6** | **15.6** | **438.0** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Minneapolis** | 14 | 37 | 16 | 48 | 30 | 85 | 36 | 110 |
| Mn-May | 14 | 37 | 16 | 48 | 30 | 85 | 38 | 131 |
| Mn-Sept | 13 | 212 | 10 | 172 | 23 | 384 | 25 | 400 |
| Mn-Oct | 39 | 332 | 25 | 298 | 64 | 630 | 69 | 675 |
| **Monthly Avg** | **20.0** | **154.5** | **16.8** | **141.5** | **36.8** | **296.0** | **42.0** | **329.0** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Indianapolis** Mar | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 24 | 22 | 98 |
| Indy-April | 0 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 60 | 16 | 99 |
| Indy-May | 0 | 0 | 21 | 42 | 21 | 42 | 39 | 98 |
| Indy-Sept | 0 | 0 | 8 | 48 | 8 | 48 | 26 | 104 |
| Indy-Oct | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 62 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Monthly Avg** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 38.8 | 11.2 | 38.8 | 26.6 | 92.2 |
| | | | | | | | |
| **After School Avg** | 4.5 | 46.0 | 8.8 | 69.8 | 13.4 | 115.8 | 23.6 | 444.8 |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | **Table** | **3** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROJECT TOTALS BY MONTH BY SITE - SUMMER MONTHS and OVERALL** | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Part 1** | | **Number of Participants & their Hours** | | | | | |
| | Current Participants | | New this Month | | Old+New | Old+New | |
| | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | |
| **Summer Months** | | | | | | | |
| L-June | 76 | 152 | 5 | 10 | 81 | 162 | |
| L-July | 0 | 0 | 75 | 3000 | 75 | 3000 | |
| L-Aug | 0 | 0 | 105 | 6300 | 105 | 6300 | |
| S-June | 91 | 1017 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 1017 | |
| S-July | 0 | 0 | 141 | 16215 | 141 | 16215 | |
| P-June | 54 | 6480 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 6480 | |
| P-July | 0 | 0 | 54 | 2592 | 54 | 2592 | |
| Mn-June | 76 | 208 | 300 | 1775 | 376 | 1983 | |
| Mn-July | 424 | 3813 | 46 | 1396 | 470 | 5209 | |
| Mn-Aug | 678 | 3793 | 78 | 950 | 756 | 4743 | |
| Indy-June | 91 | 2065 | 14 | 921 | 105 | 2986 | |
| Indy-July | 185 | 4945 | 35 | 1680 | 220 | 6625 | |
| Indy-Aug | 85 | 940 | 1123 | 4170 | 1208 | 5110 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Monthly Average** | 135.4 | 1801.0 | 152.0 | 3000.7 | 287.4 | 4801.7 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| **After School Avg** | 105.3 | 1332.4 | 30.4 | 360.1 | 135.7 | 1692.5 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| **OVERALL** | | | | | | | |
| **Monthly Average** | 120.3 | 1566.7 | 91.2 | 1680.4 | 211.5 | 3247.1 | |
| | | | | | Per Youth= | 15 Hrs/Mo | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | Table | 3 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROJECT TOTALS BY MONTH BY SITE - SUMMER MONTHS and OVERALL** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| **Part 2** | | **Paid Staff** | | | | |
| | Sworn | Sworn | Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both |
| | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| **Summer Months** | | | | | | |
| L-June | 0 | 0 | 4 | 520 | 4 | 520 |
| L-July | 8 | 128 | 23 | 2020 | 31 | 2148 |
| L-Aug | 8 | 128 | 27 | 2104 | 35 | 2232 |
| S-June | 8 | 129 | 14 | 1165 | 22 | 1294 |
| S-July | 11 | 1921 | 48 | 9208 | 59 | 11129 |
| P-June | 0 | 0 | 4 | 420 | 4 | 420 |
| P-July | 0 | 0 | 4 | 360 | 4 | 360 |
| Mn-June | 2 | 18 | 3 | 35 | 5 | 53 |
| Mn-July | 2 | 34 | 3 | 86 | 5 | 120 |
| Mn-Aug | 3 | 62 | 3 | 51 | 6 | 113 |
| Indy-June | 12 | 374 | 6 | 26 | 18 | 400 |
| Indy-July | 9 | 268 | 6 | 36 | 15 | 304 |
| Indy-Aug | 16 | 399 | 15 | 65 | 31 | 464 |
| | | | | | | |
| **Monthly Average** | **6.1** | **266.2** | **12.3** | **1238.2** | **18.4** | **1504.4** |
| | | | | | | |
| **After School Avg** | **4.6** | **36.2** | **5.6** | **292.8** | **10.2** | **329.0** |
| | | | | | | |
| **OVERALL** | | | | | | |
| **Monthly Average** | **5.3** | **151.2** | **9.0** | **765.5** | **14.3** | **916.7** |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | Sworn | Sworn | Volunteer Staff Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both | | All Staff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Sworn | Sworn | Non-Sworn | Non-Sworn | Both | Both | | |
| | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours | # of | Hours |
| **Summer Months** | | | | | | | | |
| L-June | 1 | 4 | 6 | 120 | 7 | 124 | 11 | 644 |
| L-July | 2 | 24 | 10 | 160 | 12 | 184 | 43 | 2332 |
| L-Aug | 2 | 24 | 10 | 160 | 12 | 184 | 47 | 2416 |
| S-June | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 27 | 1314 |
| S-July | 0 | 0 | 56 | 1322 | 56 | 1322 | 115 | 12451 |
| P-June | 0 | 0 | 2 | 120 | 2 | 120 | 6 | 540 |
| P-July | 0 | 0 | 2 | 80 | 2 | 80 | 6 | 440 |
| Mn-June | 50 | 339 | 20 | 213 | 70 | 552 | 75 | 605 |
| Mn-July | 64 | 1358 | 23 | 232 | 87 | 1590 | 92 | 1710 |
| Mn-Aug | 65 | 1256 | 22 | 400 | 87 | 1656 | 93 | 1769 |
| Indy-June | 0 | 0 | 13 | 52 | 13 | 52 | 31 | 452 |
| Indy-July | 0 | 0 | 12 | 32 | 12 | 32 | 27 | 336 |
| Indy-Aug | 0 | 0 | 21 | 42 | 21 | 42 | 52 | 506 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| **Monthly Average** | 14.2 | 231.2 | 15.5 | 227.2 | 29.7 | 458.3 | 48.1 | 1962.7 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| **After School Avg** | 4.5 | 46.0 | 8.8 | 69.8 | 13.4 | 115.8 | 23.6 | 444.8 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| **OVERALL** | | | | | | | | |
| **Monthly Average** | **9.3** | **138.6** | **12.2** | **148.5** | **21.5** | **287.1** | **35.8** | **1203.7** |

**Table 3**

**PROJECT TOTALS BY MONTH BY SITE - SUMMER MONTHS and OVERALL**

**Part 3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# APPENDIX C

Table 4: Focus Group Demographics
Youth by Site and Total

Table 5: Focus Group Demographics
Teachers, Partners, Police, Staff, Parents/Coaches
and Summary

# Table 4: Focus Group Demographics – Youth by Site and Total

### Site: Lawrence
### N = 60

**Age**                                                 **Race**

**w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f**

| | w/m (n = 4) | w/f (n = 1) | h/m (n = 23) | h/f (n = 26) | b/m (n = 1) | b/f (n = 3) | a/m (n = 2) | a/f (n = 0) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 1 | | 1 | 6 | | | | |
| 11 | | | 1 | 12 | 1 | | 1 | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 1 | | 3 | | |
| 14 | | | 5 | | | | 1 | |
| 15 | 1 | | 1 | 7 | | | | |
| 16 | | | 3 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | 2 | | | | | |

### Site: Stamford
### N = 33

**Age**                                                 **Race**

**w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f**

| | w/m (n = 5) | w/f (n = 0) | h/m (n = 5) | h/f (n = 10) | b/m (n = 6) | b/f (n = 7) | a/m (n = 0) | a/f (n = 0) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | |

| | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | |
| 13 | 4 | | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 | | |
| 14 | | | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | |

**Table 4: Focus Group Demographics - Youth (continued)**

**Site: Indianapolis**
**N = 23**

**Age**                               **Race**

w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f
(n = 0)       (n = 0) (n = 0) (n = 0) (n = 15) (n = 8) (n = 0) (n = 0)

| | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 9 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 10 | | | | | 3 | 3 | | |
| 11 | | | | | 3 | 1 | | |
| 12 | | | | | 9 | 2 | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | |

**Site: Minneapolis**
**N = 28**

**Age**                               **Race**

w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f

| | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 10 | | | 2 | | | 1 | 3 | |
| 11 | 1 | | | | 2 | 4 | 1 | |
| 12 | | | 3 | | | 5 | | |
| 13 | | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 |
| 14 | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | |

**Table 4: Focus Group Demographics - Youth (continued)**

**Site: Portland**
**N = 26**

**Age**                                    **Race**

w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f
(n =11)          (n = 5) (n = 2) (n = 0) (n = 2) (n = 2) (n = 2) (n = 2)

| | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| 9 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 10 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| 11 | 4 | | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| 12 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 2 |
| 13 | 1 | 3 | | | | 1 | | |
| 14 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| 15 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | |

**Combined Sites**

**N = 170**

# Age

# Race

**w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f**
**(n = 21)   (n = 6) (n = 35) (n = 37) (n = 26) (n = 33) (n = 8) (n = 4)**

| Age | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| 9 | 1 | | | | | 2 | | |
| 10 | 2 | | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | |
| 11 | 5 | | 1 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 4 | |
| 12 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 10 | | 2 |
| 13 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 7 | | 2 |
| 14 | | | 6 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | |
| 15 | 2 | | 1 | 7 | | | | |
| 16 | | | 3 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | 2 | | | | | |

**52.9% Male**          **15.9% Caucasian**          **42.4% Hispanic Average Age = 12.16**
**47.1% Female**          **34.7% African American     7.1% Other**

**Demographics for the youth match those obtained from the sites of their program participants (see Table 1)**

## Table 5: Focus Group Demographics – non youth

### Focus Group: Teachers
### N = 7

# Site

# Race

**w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f**
**(n=3)   (n=1) (n=1) (n=1) (n=1) (n=0) (n=0 ) (n=0)**

| Site | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawrence | | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| Stamford | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Indianapolis | | | | | | | | |
| Minneapolis | | | | | | | | |
| Portland | | | | | | | | |

### Focus Group: Partners
### N = 14

# Site

# Race

**w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f**
**(n=6)   (n=5) (n=0) (n=0) (n=3) (n=0) (n=0 ) (n=0)**

| Site | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawrence | | | | | | | | |
| Stamford | | | | | | | | |
| Indianapolis | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | | |
| Minneapolis | 5 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| Portland | | 3 | | | | | | |

**Focus Group: Police**
**N = 26**

**Site**                                                **Race**

w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f i/m i/f
(n=11)          (n=2) (n=2) (n=0) (n=7) (n=2) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0)

| Site | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f | i/m | i/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawrence | 3 | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Stamford | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| Indianapolis | 3 | | | | 3 | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Minneapolis | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | |
| Portland | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | |

a = Asian
i = American Indian

**Table 5: Focus Group Demographics – non youth (continued)**

**Focus Group: Staff**
**N = 15**

**Site**                                                **Race**

w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f
(n=3)   (n=9) (n=0) (n=0) (n=2) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0)

| Site | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawrence | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Stamford | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | |
| Indianapolis | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Minneapolis | | 5 | | | | | 1 | |
| Portland | | 2 | | | 1 | | | |

**Focus Group: Parents/Coaches**

**Site**                                          **Race**

**w/m w/f h/m h/f b/m b/f a/m a/f i/m i/f**
**(n=11) (n=10) (n=1) (n=5) (n=8) (n=11) (n=0) (n=1) (n=0) (n=1)**

| Site | w/m | w/f | h/m | h/f | b/m | b/f | a/m | a/f | i/m | i/f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lawrence | 5 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Stamford | | | | 3 | | 1 | | | | |
| Indianapolis | 6 | 6 | | | 7 | 9 | | | | |
| Minneapolis | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Portland | | | | | | | | | | |

a = Asian
i = American Indian

170 – youth
14 – partners
7-- teachers
48 – parents
26 – police
15 - staff

Total interviewed for focus groups - 280

# APPENDIX D

Table 6: Questions Regarding Youth Attitudes Toward the Police

Table 7: Academic and Behavior Grade Comparisons

Table 8: Questions Relating to Gangs

Table 9: Data concerning the Youth's Perceptions of the Extent to which
the Program Assisted or Prevented Them from Joining Gangs

in the Neighborhood and at School

Table 10: Substance Use Questions

**Table    6**
**Questions Regarding Youth Attitudes Toward the Police**

**If YOU were in trouble, would you go to a Police Officer for help?**
93% said YES at least some of the time - 60% ALL of the time-
Only 7% would not.

|  |  | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Yes - ALL the time | Count | 34 | 19 | 53 |
|  | % within | 61.82 | 57.58 | 60.23 |
| MOST of the time | Count | 11 | 8 | 19 |
|  | % within | 20.00 | 24.24 | 21.59 |
| SOME of the time | Count | 5 | 5 | 10 |
|  | % within | 9.09 | 15.15 | 11.36 |
| NO | Count | 5 | 1 | 6 |
|  | % within | 9.09 | 3.03 | 6.82 |
| Total Count |  | 55 | 33 | 88 |

| | | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Chi Sq = 2.01 df = 1 p=ns

**If your PARENTS were in trouble, would you go to police for help?**
If anything, a stronger response. Only 2% would not,
71% said ALL of the time.

| | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Yes - ALL the time | Count | 40 | 22 | 62 |
| | % within | 72.73 | 66.67 | 70.45 |
| | | | | |
| MOST of the time | Count | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| | % within | 18.18 | 24.24 | 20.45 |
| | | | | |
| SOME of the time | Count | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| | % within | 9.09 | 3.03 | 6.82 |
| | | | | |
| NO | Count | | 2 | 2 |
| | % within | | 6.06 | 2.27 |
| Total Count | | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 4.92 df = 3 p=ns

**Table     6     continued**

**If your BROTHER or SISTER were in trouble, would you go to police for help?**
Same as above - only 8% would not -
67% would ALL of the time

| | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Yes - ALL the time | Count | 38 | 20 | 58 |
| | % within | 69.09 | 62.50 | 66.67 |
| | | | | |
| MOST of the time | Count | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| | % within | 14.55 | 21.88 | 17.24 |
| | | | | |
| SOME of the time | Count | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| | % within | 10.91 | 3.13 | 8.05 |
| | | | | |
| NO | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| | % within | 5.45 | 12.50 | 8.05 |

|              |     |     |     |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Total Count  | 55  | 32  | 87  |
| % within     | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 3.5 df = 3 p=ns

Almost every child indicated they trusted the police to help when
someone was in trouble.
93% of the time for themselves, 98% for a parent, and 94% for a sibling.

**Table 7**

**STAMFORD**
**Academic and Behavior grade comparisons:**
**Pre-Post:**

t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means
**GPA's**

|                     | Start GPA  | End GPA  |          |
|---------------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Mean                | 2.4375281  | 2.794124 |          |
| Variance            | 0.4375893  | 0.50629  |          |
| Observations        | 89         | 89       |          |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.6948129  |          |          |
| df                  | 88         |          |          |
| t Stat              | -6.249168  |          |          |
| P(T<=t) one-tail    | 7.167E-09  | <.00001  |          |
| t Critical one-tail | 1.662354   |          |          |
| P(T<=t) two-tail    | 1.433E-08  |          |          |
| t Critical two-tail | 1.9872914  |          |          |

t-Test: Paired Two Sample for Means
**Behavior Grades**

|                     | Start BPA  | End BPA   |          |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|----------|
| Mean                | 3.5123333  | 3.681356  |          |
| Variance            | 0.5035613  | 0.371941  |          |
| Observations        | 90         | 90        |          |
| Pearson Correlation | 0.6323727  |           |          |
| df                  | 89         |           |          |
| t Stat              | -2.799164  |           |          |
| P(T<=t) one-tail    | 0.0031409  | <.003     |          |
| t Critical one-tail | 1.6621561  |           |          |
| P(T<=t) two-tail    | 0.0062818  |           |          |
| t Critical two-tail | 1.9869776  |           |          |

NOTE: Start = pre = Q1+Q2 End = post = Q4          2000-2001 academic year

Grades based on Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, & Science
Both Academic and Behavior grades improved significantly.


## LAWRENCE
### Academic and Behavior grade comparisons : <u>Treatment v. Control Group</u>:

t-Test: Two-Sample
**GPA's Q4**

| | Pgm Kids | Controls |
|---|---|---|
| Mean | 3.59375 | 2.423935 |
| Variance | 0.8011068 | 0.459372 |
| Observations | 73 | 155 |
| Pooled Variance | 0.5682433 | |
| df | 226 | |
| t Stat | 10.932254 | |
| P(T<=t) one-tail | 6.58E-23 | <.0001 |
| t Critical one-tail | 1.6516242 | |
| P(T<=t) two-tail | 1.32E-22 | |
| t Critical two-tail | 1.9705158 | |

t-Test: Two- Sample
**Conduct Grades Q4**

| | Pgm Kids | Controls |
|---|---|---|
| Mean | 3.7681159 | 2.777143 |
| Variance | 1.0924979 | 0.932808 |
| Observations | 69 | 175 |
| Pooled Variance | 0.9776794 | |
| df | 242 | |
| t Stat | 7.0503759 | |
| P(T<=t) one-tail | 9.28E-12 | <.0001 |
| t Critical one-tail | 1.651174 | |
| P(T<=t) two-tail | 1.86E-11 | |
| t Critical two-tail | 1.9698155 | |

NOTE: 2000-2001 academic year
Grades based on Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, & Science

Program participants received significantly higher grades both Academically and Behaviorally
than a matched group of students drawn from the same schools.


### Table 8
### Questions relating to Gangs


About half - 42% - say they are aware of gangs in their neighborhood

| | | | Gender Boy | Girl | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Are there** | Yes | Count | 26 | 11 | 37 |
| **any gangs** | | % within | 47.27 | 33.33 | 42.05 |
| **in your** | No | Count | 29 | 22 | 51 |
| **neighborhood?** | | % within | 52.73 | 66.67 | 57.95 |
| | Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | | % within Gender | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 1.645 df=1 p=ns


A significantly greater percent of Boys (35.8%) than Girls (15.6%)
report that there ARE gangs in their schools.

The majority of both groups are unaware of any.

| | | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| **Are there** | Yes | Count | 19 | 5 | 24 |
| **any gangs** | | % within | 35.85 | 15.63 | 28.24 |
| **at school?** | No | Count | 34 | 27 | 61 |
| | | % within | 64.15 | 84.38 | 71.76 |
| | Total | Count | 53 | 32 | 85 |
| | | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 4.028 df=1 p<.05

Almost no one reported having a sibling in a gang (4.6%)
95% said no.

| | | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| **Do you have** | Yes | Count | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| **and brothers** | | % within | 5.45 | 3.03 | 4.55 |
| **or sisters in** | No | Count | 52 | 32 | 84 |
| **any gangs?** | | % within | 94.55 | 96.97 | 95.45 |
| | Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = .28 df=1 p=ns

**Table 8          continued**

While the majority said no (73%), there was a <u>trend</u> for a greater
proportion of Boys to say they had friends in gangs (32.7%)
than Girls (15.2%).

| | | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| **Do you have** | Yes | Count | 18 | 5 | 23 |
| **any friends** | | % within | 32.73 | 15.15 | 26.14 |
| **who are gang** | No | Count | 37 | 28 | 65 |
| **members?** | | % within | 67.27 | 84.85 | 73.86 |
| | Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 3.30 df=1 p<.07

84% report never having been asked to join a gang at school,

but 16% (n=14) were.          (cf the special analysis of these 14)

| | | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| **Have you ever** | Yes | Count | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| **been asked to** | | % within | 16.36 | 15.15 | 15.91 |
| **join a gang** | No | Count | 46 | 28 | 74 |
| **at school?** | | % within | 83.64 | 84.85 | 84.09 |
| | Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = .02 df = 1 p=ns

80% said they had not been asked to join a neighborhood gang,
but 20% did (n=17).          (cf the special analysis of these 17)

| | | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| **Hove you ever** | Yes | Count | 13 | 4 | 17 |
| **been asked to** | | % within | 23.64 | 12.12 | 19.32 |
| **join a gang in** | No | Count | 42 | 29 | 71 |
| **your** | | % within | 76.36 | 87.88 | 80.68 |
| **neighborhood?** | Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 1.76 df=1 p=ns

## Table 8          continued

**Has being in this program <u>prevented</u> you from being in a gang?**
<u>Very strong response</u> - 76% said YES at least part of the time-
52% said ALL of the time. Only 24% said no.

| | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Yes - ALL the time | Count | 30 | 16 | 46 |
| | % within | 54.55 | 48.48 | 52.27 |
| MOST of the time | Count | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| | % within | 20.00 | 18.18 | 19.32 |
| SOME of the time | Count | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| | % within | 3.64 | 6.06 | 4.55 |
| NO | Count | 12 | 9 | 21 |
| | % within | 21.82 | 27.27 | 23.86 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Count | | 55 | 33 | 88 | |
| % within | | 100 | 100 | 100 | |

Chi Sq = .70 df=1 p=ns

**Does being in this program help you to say NO to being in a gang?**
<u>A stronger response</u> - 87.5% said YES at least some of the time-
and 68% said ALL of the time. Only 12.5% said no.

| | | Gender Boy | Girl | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes - ALL the time | Count | 39 | 21 | 60 |
| | % within | 70.91 | 63.64 | 68.18 |
| MOST of the time | Count | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| | % within | 14.55 | 15.15 | 14.77 |
| SOME of the time | Count | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| | % within | 3.64 | 6.06 | 4.55 |
| NO | Count | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| | % within | 10.91 | 15.15 | 12.50 |
| Total Count | | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| % within | | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = .73 df = 1 p=ns

**Table     9**
**Data concerning the youth's perceptions of the extent to which the program assisted
or prevented them from joining gangs in the neighborhood and at school**

15 of the 17 (88%) who were asked to join a neighborhood gang reported
that being in the program **prevented** them from joining

**I was asked to join a neighborhood gang**

| | | | Gender Boy | Girl | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Has being in this program **prevented** you from being in a gang? | Yes - ALL the time | Count | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| | Yes - MOST of the time | Count | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| | Yes - SOME of the time | Count | 1 | | 1 |

| | | | Boy | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NO | | Count | 2 | | 2 |
| | Total Count | | 13 | 4 | 17 |

16 of 17 (94%) of those asked to join a neighborhood gang said being in the program
**helped them say NO**

**I was asked to join a neighborhood gang**

| | | | | Gender | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Does being in this program | Yes - ALL the time | Count | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| **help you to say NO** to being in | Yes - MOST of the time | Count | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| a gang? | Yes - SOME of the time | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | NO | Count | 1 | | 1 |
| | Total Count | | 13 | 4 | 17 |

**Table     9     continued**

11 of the 14 (79%) who were asked to join a gang at school said
that being in the program **prevented** them from joining

**I was asked to join a gang at school**

| | | | | Gender | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Has being in this program | Yes - ALL the time | Count | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| **prevented** you from being in | Yes - MOST of the time | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| a gang? | Yes - SOME of the time | Count | 1 | | 1 |
| | NO | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 |

|  |  | Boy | Girl | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Count |  | 9 | 5 | 14 |

ALL (100%) of the 14 youth asked to join a gang at school said that being
in the program **helped them say NO**

**I was asked to join a gang at school**

|  |  |  | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Does being in this program | Yes - ALL the time | Count | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| **help you to say** | Yes - MOST of the time | Count | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| **NO** to being in a gang? |  | Total Count | 9 | 5 | 14 |

In summary:
88% said it prevented them from joining a neighborhood gang and 94% said it helped
79% said it prevented them from joining a gang at school and all (100%) said it helped

It would appear the programs are having a positive influence in this area

**Table    10**
**Substance Use Questions**

**How often do you drink alcohol?**
only 15% yes - and half of those are less than once a month
about 6% fairly frequent drinkers --- 85% report never drinking

|  |  | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Never | Count | 47 | 28 | 75 |
|  | % within | 85.45 | 84.85 | 85.23 |
| Less than once a month | Count | 5 | 2 | 7 |
|  | % within | 9.09 | 6.06 | 7.95 |
| Once a month | Count |  | 1 | 1 |
|  | % within |  | 3.03 | 1.14 |

| | | Once a week | Count | 2 | | 2 |
| Once a week | Count | 2 | | 2 |

| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Once a week | Count | 2 | | 2 |
| | % within | 3.64 | | 2.27 |
| Several times a week | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | % within | 1.82 | 6.06 | 3.41 |
| Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 4.20 df = 4 p = ns

### How often use Marijuana?
90% no --- about 7 % fairly heavy users

| | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Never | Count | 49 | 30 | 79 |
| | % within | 89.09 | 90.91 | 89.77 |
| Less than once a month | Count | 3 | | 3 |
| | % within | 5.45 | | 3.41 |
| Once a week | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | % within | 3.64 | 3.03 | 3.41 |
| Several times a week | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | % within | 1.82 | 6.06 | 3.41 |
| | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| Total | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 2.92 df = 3 p=ns

**Table    10    continued**

### How often do you Sniff or Huff?
Not in their culture

| | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Never | Count | 55 | 32 | 87 |
| | % within | 100.00 | 96.97 | 98.86 |
| Several times a week | Count | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within | | 3.03 | 1.14 |

| | | Total | 55 | 33 | 88 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | Count | | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | % within | | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 1.69 df = 1 p=ns


**How often do you use other drugs?**
97% no --- only 3 individuals said yes

| | | Gender | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Boy | Girl | Total |
| Never | Count | 53 | 32 | 85 |
| | % within | 96.36 | 96.97 | 96.59 |
| Less than once a month | Count | 1 | | 1 |
| | % within | 1.82 | | 1.14 |
| Once a week | Count | 1 | | 1 |
| | % within | 1.82 | | 1.14 |
| Several times a week | Count | | 1 | 1 |
| | % within | | 3.03 | 1.14 |
| Total | Count | 55 | 33 | 88 |
| | % within | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chi Sq = 2.87 df = 3 p=ns


# APPENDIX E

List of Contact People by Site


Indianapolis, IN:

Liz Allison, Indianapolis Police Department, 50 North Alabama St.
Indianapolis, IN 46204. (317) 327-3452. A3663@indygov.org.

Lawrence, MA:

        Jim Arnold, Hoops for Hope, P.O. Box 375, Andover, MA 01810

                (978) 470-8136. Arnold357@aol.com.

Minneapolis, MN:

        Sgt. Nancy Dunlap, Minneapolis Police Department, 1025 Broadway Street N.E.,

                Minneapolis, MN 55413. (612) 627-5107

                Nancy.Dunlap@ci.minneapolis.mn.us.

Portland, OR:

        Maura White-Cioeta, Portland Police Activities League,

                449 N.E. Emerson, Portland, OR. 97211. (503) 823-0250

                Mwhite@police.ci.portland.or.us

Stamford, CT:

        Mike Duggan, Domus Foundation, 417 Shippan Avenue.,

                Stamford, CT. 60901 (203) 324-4277.

                passages@ntplx.net